A CHURCHMAN AND HIS CHURCH

A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE

Class 280.3R Book B267
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

A CHURCHMAN AND HIS CHURCH

A SERIES OF ADDRESSES ON MATTERS OF INTEREST AT THE PRESENT DAY

BY

A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A.

VICAR OF ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST, BOSCOMBE
HON. CANON OF SOUTHWARK

"τῳ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεῖ πάντα συνᾴδει τὰ ὑπάρχοντα.
With Truth all facts and realities agree.
ARISTOTLE.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1917

280.3R
B267

64383

CCN THEO SEMINA
LIBRARY

PREFACE

THIS little book is issued at an anxious time. The great struggle which convulses the world finds its counterpart in the conflict within the Church. In both arenas principles are at stake, so great, so far-reaching, that they forbid the antagonists to lay down their arms. That this is so in the Church will be evident to any who are at the pains to study these pages. I have long learned to respect the sincerity and devotion of many from whom I differ most, and just for that reason I desire to bring those differences into daylight for candid examination. If I have written plainly and simply, it has been, I trust, in that spirit of charity without which all our doings are nothing worth.

The Addresses are primarily dedicated to my parishioners and congregation, for I hold it a first duty of one entrusted with a cure of souls to instruct and guide them in a day of perplexity.

A. E. B.-L.

Boscombe,
Michaelmas, 1917.

CONTENTS

PAGE

I. THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE . . . 1

II. THE CHURCH 14

1. The Holy Catholic Church.
2. The Church of England.

III. THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY 36

IV. HOLY BAPTISM 54

1. Adult.
2. Infant.

V. HOLY COMMUNION 76

VI. THE PRAYERBOOK 103

VII. THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE 116

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE

SOME time ago it was my happiness to meet a young clergyman whom I had known as a lad, but had hardly seen since that time, and certainly not since his Ordination. Naturally he had much to tell me, and we talked of old times, of his prospects in the ministry, of the outlook in the National Church. In the course of an interesting conversation he frankly confessed that his position as a Churchman was not what it had been. Brought up in Evangelical surroundings, he had been attracted by the "bright Services," by the energy and devotion of the Anglican party, and after serving a curacy or two in their churches, he considered himself one of that school.

Coming to details, of which he spoke freely, I found that he now favoured the ideas associated with the Mass rather than those proper to the Holy Communion, and when I pointed out with all seriousness that there is scarce one thing in common between them, his reply was that the Holy Spirit was given to lead into all truth, and that we might safely "trust the developments of Catholic doctrine." Our discussion was thus brought round to the question of Authority, and where it lies. For his part he stoutly maintained that in matters of faith and doctrine such authority resides in the Church, while I, not unmindful of my Ordination, tried to convince him that, for the English clergy at least, it is to be found in Holy

Scripture. We parted the best of friends, and went our ways.

Now, I confess to being somewhat anxious when I reflect that my friend stands for a large and increasing number of the younger clergy who in a time of much mental and spiritual bewilderment are not sure of their anchorage, and seek rest for their souls in the absorption of social activities, particularly among men and boys. If questioned as to their "views," which are often extreme, they shelter themselves as he did behind "the developments of Catholic doctrine."

The Church's Doctrine

On the main issue, however, I was unquestionably right; for loyal Churchmen the ultimate court of appeal is Holy Scripture. The mind of the Church is unmistakable: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." Our Sixth Article is nothing if it is not explicit.

But my friend urges: That is no longer a tenable position, it is out of date; and, in any case, all that the Reformers did was to set an infallible Book over against Pope and Councils and an infallible Church. The antithesis is clever, somewhat trite, and wholly misleading. Infallibility does not mean the same thing to Protestants and Romanists, nor is the Holy Scripture of the Article the same Scripture as that of the Roman Communion; the two books differ in their contents, their translation, their critical and literary value,[1] and can better be contrasted than compared. But,

[1] The Vulgate of Pope Sixtus V is not "out of the original tongues," is

none the less, in the sixteenth century the Roman theologians appealed to Scripture not less sincerely than Luther. They believed that they could meet Scripture with Scripture, but their appeal was quite different from his. To the Roman, the Bible was a sort of spiritual law-book, a collection of proof-texts for the slaying of theological Philistines. To the Reformers, it was a personal, not a dogmatic, revelation; the record of a fellowship with God enjoyed by men in past ages, which was still the privilege of all who shared a living union with Jesus Christ. Their conception of faith as a personal trust in a personal Saviour had given them the master-key to Scripture.

Widely, then, as they differed, the great antagonists were at one in regarding Holy Scripture as the ultimate authority. Nor was this attitude of the medieval Church out of harmony with that of primitive Christianity; nothing is more marked in the writings of the Fathers of the Early Church than their reverent and consistent appeal to Scripture as the Word of God. What the Reformers and their opponents did, an Irenæus, a Tertullian, an Origen, did also. Augustine's memorable words sum up the position of the first four centuries: "If it is established by the clear authority of the divine Scriptures, those, I mean, that are called Canonical in the Church, it is to be believed without any doubt. But other witnesses or testimonies which are used to persuade you to believe anything, you may believe or not, just as you shall see that they have or have not any weight giving them a just claim to your regard." [1]

---

only a translation of a translation, and includes a number of apocryphal books which the Early Church carefully distinguished from Holy Scripture. See our Article VI.

[1] *Ad Paulin*, Ep. 147.

Such, then, was the recognised practice at the beginning of the Reformation. It was only when the Roman doctors and apologists found themselves unable to meet with their fragmentary texts men who regarded and used the Scriptures as a living unity, that they changed their method. "They realised that if they were to meet their opponents on equal terms they too must recognise a unity in Scripture. They did so by creating an external and arbitrary unity by means of the dogmatic tradition of the medieval Church." [1] The Council of Trent by its decree gave such tradition a place alongside Scripture as an equal authority. But in so doing they replaced the natural unity of Scripture by an artificial unity of their own making, and abandoned to the Protestant Churches, our own among them, an historical position dating back to the apostolic age.

Our Church's standpoint then is clear: Bishop Gore writes, "The Church of England . . . has associated itself with the Protestants in what it believed to be their legitimate protest and appeal—their protest against the exaggerated claim of the medieval Papacy and the medieval accumulation of dogma, and their appeal to the primitive Church, and especially to Scripture, as the sole final testing-ground of dogmatic requirements . . . so that even things ordained by General Councils as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture. . . . It is this appeal to Scripture, constantly insisted on, which qualifies the Catholicism of the Anglican Church as Scriptural or liberal." [2]

This is opportunely said, and welcome from the Bishop of

[1] Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, i. 455.
[2] *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship*, 1914.

Oxford. You will understand the more readily that when young and ardent Churchmen like my friend abandon our Anglican position, they break not with "Puritan innovation," but with the usage of the Catholic Church.

You ask me how I account for so revolutionary a change? Two reasons, both influential, go far to explain it—

1. The Higher Criticism

There can be no question that the Higher Criticism has profoundly influenced the relation of numbers of the clergy towards the Bible. As a method of literary investigation into the contents, age, authorship and genuineness of ancient documents, it is altogether legitimate. To myself, indeed, it is a matter of thankfulness that every "jot and tittle" of Scripture has been subjected to a criticism so searching, so prolonged, that it is unparalleled in literature. Protestant Christianity welcomes light, come whence it may. But the conclusions of the advanced critics as to the Old Testament, and particularly as to the Pentateuch, are so extravagant that Lord Salisbury's famous dictum: "You can never trust an expert," is justified. To-day some of the most distinguished of these critics, such as Hommel, Halévy, Sayce and Eerdmans have felt compelled to abandon what is known as the Graf-Wellhausen theory of the Pentateuch as baseless, and its present upholders will have much to do to answer Professors Strack, Dillmann and Orr, to say nothing of the Jewish barrister Wiener. We may go further and say that the critical process (which can go no further) has demonstrated the impossibility of disintegrating the Old Testament, and has actually led to the discovery of a mass of evidence as to its substantial unity.

Of course there are critics and critics, and between the

extremists and the more conservative of the English scholars there is a wide gulf, yet even of these not a few resolve the Pentateuch into myth, legend and fiction, and, as must always happen, the disparagement of the older Testament affects the credit of the New.

You have already gathered, however, that my young friend's changed standpoint was not due to the Higher Criticism; he had little knowledge of it, and what he had merely strengthened an honest conviction that he must seek a basis for faith elsewhere than in Scripture, and this he found in

2. The Authority of the Church

His position was this: It was twenty years or more after the Ascension before the oral teaching of the Apostles assumed definite shape in the Synoptic Gospels, still longer before the Canon was finally fixed, and yet again longer before individual Christians could possess themselves of a portion or the whole of the New Testament. It was the Church which authenticated these "writings" as apostolic, it was the Church which told men they were inspired. Clearly, then, the Bible rests upon the authority of the Church, it is "the child of the Church"; and if we accept the Church's authority as to what is, and what is not, Scripture, it were mere folly to deny its right to interpret and apply it.

There is obvious truth here, and we have an excellent illustration how a little truth may give currency to simple error. No one denies that the Church was responsible for the collection and authentication of the New Testament "writings." That the task was prolonged is certain, for a swarm of apocryphal books appeared at the close of the

apostolic age, claiming apostolic authority, and much sifting and rejecting had to be done; but done it was, and the Canon finally fixed, though we cannot say precisely when, or who were the persons who did it. The Church's judgment was never formulated in a General Council, but it was decisive, and no one of these apocryphal writings appears in what Eusebius (A.D. 315) calls *homolegoumena*, or Scriptures universally accepted.

If this is all that is meant by "the Church gave us the Bible," I for one shall not dispute it. How could we have got it in any other way? To say, in this sense, "the Church was before the Bible," is a mere truism; one might as well say, "the Church was before the Word was *printed*"! The real question is this: Was the Church before the Word was *spoken?* The "Sayings" of our Lord, for instance, were current, enforced by apostles, obeyed by disciples, long before the Canon was fixed; was it the Church's authorisation which gave them their ultimate authority, or was it due to their being "the words of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xx. 35)? You reply, "It was due to the divine Speaker, the Church simply guaranteed their genuineness." Exactly, and so it was with the Gospels and Epistles generally: the personal authority of Apostle and Evangelist was unique and final so long as they were alive, and when they entered on their reward that authority was naturally and inevitably transferred to their writings. It was never bestowed by the Church: it was inherent from the first.

The office of the Church, then, is plain. It may be compared to that of the Samaritan woman[1] in John iv. who invited her fellow-townsmen to come and see One who had told her all that ever she did. She was the

[1] Litton's Dogmatic Theology. *The Rule of Faith.*

means, or the occasion, of their becoming acquainted with the Messiah, but she did not make Him what He was, nor could she produce saving faith in them; they believed, when they did believe, not because of her saying, but because they had heard Him themselves, and realised that He was the Saviour of the world. Litton makes the sound comment that until a similar personal experience is wrought by its message, Scripture is never received on its proper grounds.

Men like my friend who are "sacerdotalists" are compelled to accept his position towards Scripture, for, look where they will in the original documents to which Christianity appeals, they find no warrant for their distinctive doctrines, and rely perforce upon what they term "the authority of the Church." Unfortunately they do not mean the authority of their own Church, to which their obedience is pledged, but of something vague and nebulous which they are pleased to regard as "the Church," something in any case medieval, unreformed, and for the most part unscriptural in its doctrine.

The results of this disparagement of Scripture, whatever its cause, are extremely serious. I fail to see how the Church of England can ever accomplish those great ends for which she exists so long as it continues. The most urgent need of the time is a reinstatement of the authority of Scripture in the hearts of men and the pulpits of our churches, with due regard to all proved facts in its literary history. Is such reinstatement possible? My own experience (for what it is worth) convinces me it is. There are already symptoms of a changed attitude; men are beginning to tire of a barren criticism, and to turn their thoughts elsewhere. Our next battlefield will probably be the foundations of ethics, in other words, of morals and con-

duct, public and private. In that case the Bible, "tried to the uttermost," will come to its own again.

Meanwhile, let me ask you to ponder three steadying facts with which criticism is powerless to deal. They have often been a help to myself. The first is—

The Self Witness of Scripture

It is a certain truth that in Scripture there is a voice which appeals to something in man which is not critical, but faces God. It possesses an original authority to which in every age will and conscience have bowed. Criticism is concerned with the external form, but there is something which criticism cannot touch. "The divine force behind the Bible," writes Professor Sanday, "is one that can be felt—and felt directly—without any external sanction"; that is to say, the Book we call the Bible has not merely a body, patient of literary analysis, but a soul which addresses itself directly to the spirit of man. We rightly call this "revelation," for it is an unveiling to the heart of "things not seen and eternal"; the revelation of God, His holiness, love, and power; the revelation of Man, his sin and need; the revelation of God and man in the person of Jesus Christ and His salvation. Such revelation is not limited to the New Testament, it is progressive and coherent throughout the Bible, binding its many parts into one transparent unity. Genesis points to Revelation, and Revelation to Genesis. Our Church emphasises this in her Seventh Article: "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ."

Scripture, then, bears witness to itself, a witness constantly verified by human experience. You tell me that the veri-

fication of Scripture must be left to the experts; I entirely agree, but then the critical experts are not the only experts. I have gone in and out among the sorrows and joys of my people long enough to know that. For Scripture is verified not by the scholar only with his *apparatus criticus*, but by believing men, in mansion and cottage alike. It is when sorrow comes and irremediable loss, when the blinds are down and tears flow, that Christian people test the Scriptures for themselves. The man who can say: "Thy word is a lamp to my path, and light to my feet," when "the sun and the moon and the stars be darkened, and the clouds return after the rain," has verified for himself the Scriptures' claim of divine inspiration.

The Witness of The Church

The second fact to be taken into your account is the witness of the Church, Jewish and Christian. We receive the Old Testament in its integrity as handed down to us by its historical guardians, the Jewish people; we receive it as part of the Canon or Rule of Faith because of our Lord and His Apostles, who quote and classify its present books as God's Word, and no others.

Under the shelter of these sacred writings the Church has grown up for eighteen centuries, finding in them the mind of God and living upon their living message. "The true Kirk," says the old *Scots Confession*, "alwaies heares and obeyis the voice of her awin spouse and pastor." These are the original documents to which she has ever turned, and always must turn, in times of theological unrest and perplexity. The Creeds are the abiding proof of her fidelity to Scripture. Through this creative word were formed the great minds and teachers of Christendom.

Through its inspiration periods of unbelief and decadence have been transformed into periods of spiritual revival. Every such movement has had its starting-point in Scripture, as the names of Augustine, Francis, Savonarola, Luther, Knox and Wesley remind us. The Church has repaid her debt by the fulfilment of her appointed relation as a "keeper and witness" of holy writ; as a keeper, because it is hers to guard the sacred deposit from addition or mutilation; as a witness, because she hands down across the ages the evidences which prove those writings authentic.

The Witness of Jesus Christ

Lastly, we turn to the witness of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. There are not a few critics, some of them advanced, who would admit that Scripture contains divine truth, but who deny its authority. I should say the same of the Koran! The question, of course, is not whether Scripture contains truth, but whether it is truth and has authority, that is, a claim upon our obedience. The two questions are really one, for if it is not true, its authority is gone. Now upon this point there is One before whose verdict every Christian heart must bow. We do not lightly invoke the intervention of Christ on this battlefield, nor do we look to Him to decide minor questions which are within the proper compass of man's God-given faculties of criticism and investigation, but where we do call for His witness is on the broad issues of the integrity and sovereign authority of the Old Testament. Dr. Wace, the Dean of Canterbury, to whom Churchmen are greatly indebted for his powerful defence of the Prayerbook in Convocation, has put us under no less obligation by his

competent criticism of the critics, and his resolute maintenance of the integrity of the Old Testament. Let me quote him on the point before us: "It would not be fair to press Christ's use of such an expression as 'the law of Moses' as deciding the question whether Moses wrote the whole law, any more than if a man uses the expression 'the Psalms of David' he can be held to have implied that all the Psalms were written by David. Christ's authority, moreover, is too solemn and sacred to be entangled unnecessarily in such questions of detail. But there is a broad question of principle involved in His treatment of Scripture which is quite independent of these critical details, and is at the same time inseparable from the character of His teaching. That broad question is the Authority of Holy Scripture. Did our Lord simply use the Old Testament for the purpose of illustrating His teaching? Did He point to the sacred historians and prophets simply as persons whose writings contain profound truths? Or did He refer to those Scriptures as authoritative, as containing statements and revelations to which submission, and not merely recognition of their truth was due? There can be no doubt as to the answer. Our Lord treats the whole of the Old Testament, from the first chapter of Genesis onward, as authoritative—of such obligatory authority that even He Himself, His life, His work, His acts, were subject to it."[1]

I am well aware that some of you may remind me of our Lord's *Kenôsis* or self-emptying (Phil. ii. 5–8, R.V.) to which He stooped in the Incarnation, and quote Bishop Gore: "He the very God, habitually spoke in His incarnate life under the limitations of a properly human

[1] I have illustrated this in a later Address—p. 125.

consciousness."[1] That no doubt is profoundly true, but it is always to be remembered that the *Kenôsis* was a part of our Lord's actual equipment to be God's messenger to men, a divine means to a divine end. It leaves open, I admit, the precise limitations of His human knowledge, but it is nothing less than a guarantee to us that all He did say might be absolutely depended on. "He whom God sent speaketh the words of God," and to suppose that His *Kenôsis* disqualified Him to do this would indeed be a *reductio ad absurdum!*

Our Lord was no stickler for traditionalism, indeed He swept it aside with unsparing hand; even in dealing with the Old Testament He pointed out that there were elements in the Law of a temporary character, but two things stand out in His conception of the Old Testament writings: their unity, they are bound together by a great plan of salvation of which He Himself was the source and pivot; their authority, to which He deliberately subjected His life. That is all that I am now concerned to state.

In the Addresses I propose to give you on questions of present-day interest for Churchmen, I make my appeal to Scripture with confidence, not forgetful of my own Ordination vow: "Are you persuaded," asked the Bishop, "that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine necessary for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?" To which I made answer then, as I make answer now, "I am so persuaded, and have so determined, by God's grace."

[1] *Bampton Lectures.*

THE CHURCH

"Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it."—Eph. v. 25.

"The Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts xx. 28.

"Remember Thy congregation which Thou hast purchased of old, which Thou hast redeemed to be the tribe of Thine inheritance."—Ps. lxxiv. 2.

There are certain questions of permanent interest which come up periodically for settlement, yet somehow never seem to be settled. The solution appears to be found, difficulties are met, and for a few years the matter lies outside controversy; then something happens, the old question comes to the front with a new lease of life, and expositors have to deal with it once more. It is curious, but a fact. Few questions, one would think, have had greater persistency than those relating to the nature and character of the Church. "The history of a word," said Coleridge, "is sometimes more instructive than the history of a campaign," and if the word "Church" was in his mind, the philosopher was not far wrong. No Christian doubts that the Church was founded by our Lord Jesus Christ, that He has sustained and vitalised it century after century, and that it is the organ of His indwelling Spirit, yet somehow the word "Church" comes down to us with a tarnished reputation, and is even repugnant to many who claim to be Christians. This is a melancholy fact, and the saddest thing about it is that such prejudice is too often due to the Church's friends, to their

mistaken claims based upon erroneous ideas, rather than to its foes.

The Question

What, then, is the Church? The question is an old one, a very old question indeed. We find it mooted in the Epistles of Clement and Ignatius, argued in the time of Cyprian, debated in the age of Augustine. This was the question on which the Reformation centred, and within the last few years the events at Kikuyu have fanned the embers of controversy, and the old quarrel is again upon us.

I am not surprised. It is a true intuition that perceives that the issues at stake are vital. Half the controversies that harass Christendom are interwoven with this question. Could our own Church—to go no further—settle this one point, how free it would be to throw all its splendid energies into its proper work, the salvation of men! You understand, then, why "the Church" comes early in the order of our discussions. We must try and approach it with humility and with as little bias as possible. We must pray that our understanding may be enlightened to grasp the meaning of "that sacred mystery," Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and the significance of that still greater thing, the Kingdom of God, of which the Church is the handmaid and witness. My hope is to win you to what I believe to be true, rather than to attack what I have reason for holding to be false.

It is well to begin by defining our terms. This is true of all discussion, and particularly of religious discussion, where most of our mistakes come from the careless use of technical words. It was that wisest of English Churchmen, Richard Hooker, who said: "For lack of diligent observation the difference between the Church of God, mystical

and visible, then between the visible, sound and corrupted, the oversights are neither light nor few that have been committed." Keeping this caution in mind, I want you to weigh first what the word "Church" connoted at the outset, then how that meaning changed, and, lastly, its proper significance to-day.

The Primitive Church

"The Holy Catholic Church" of the Creeds was the creation of Pentecost. Until the Ascension, when the baptism of the Holy Spirit completed our Lord's work, there was no Church in the full Christian sense. The gift of the Spirit affected the position of the disciples as much collectively as personally. As iron filings scattered in confusion are instantly arranged in order and individually charged with force when a powerful magnet is brought over them, so the separate and eager individuals who followed the Lord as their Messiah were suddenly brought into a coherent and ordered fellowship, instinct with divine power, a corporate whole. This was the Church, the *Ecclesia* or assembly of the new covenant, corresponding to the synagogue or assembly of the old covenant—so closely connected in original use are the two terms Synagogue and Ecclesia. Our Church services to this day bear the mark of that original connexion, which afterwards came to be fixed in deep antagonism. From the outset the Church was the spiritual counterpart of Israel; the heir, as Dr. Hort points out,[1] of all that Israel foreshadowed but has not yet realised.

To this Church the Lord Jesus made His fourfold bequest —a common Prayer, a Sacrament of incorporation and fellowship, a Sacrament of strengthening and sustenance, and

[1] *Christian Ecclesia.*

an ordained Ministry for proclaiming that Gospel which is Himself, for in essence Christianity is Christ. In the purpose of her Founder the Church while "in the world" is not "of the world." She is called to separation, and her distinguishing mark is holiness of living. It is noteworthy that while the early disciples were known among themselves as "brethren," they were known by their foes as "the people of the Way" (see Acts ix. 2, R.V.), that is, the people who adopted a rule of life and of conduct, who followed their Master's steps, for Christianity is not a terminus, but a highway.

And here in the world to-day, despite all deformities and disfigurements, is the Divine Society, the Church which He founded nineteen centuries ago, for from Pentecost until now all the essentials of the Church have been maintained by His abiding presence.

The Ideal and the Real

At the outset, then, as you can see, the ideal Church and the real Church were not two, but one. Discipleship and Churchmanship were equivalent terms. The Church was *One* externally as well as internally. It was *Holy*, for it was in living union with the Holy One. It was *Catholic*, for it included all. The glowing language about the Church found in the Epistles, particularly in St. Paul's Ephesian letter, is perfectly intelligible. Recall for a moment his metaphors: the Church is a *Building*, a Holy Temple, spacious enough to comprehend both Jew and Gentile, and ever growing to its glorious completion. It is a *Body*, a figure even more satisfying, for here the connexion is not mechanical but vital. Its Head is Christ, and the entire organism is possessed by His Spirit, knit together in Him as

by joints and sinews, and instinct with the Life of God. Unity is the keynote of this metaphor as Holiness is of the former one. More wonderful than either, it is the *Bride* of Christ, suggesting the thought of surrender with a view to union, conscious and complete; "The twain," wrote St. Paul, "become one flesh; this mystery is great, but I speak in regard of Christ, and of the Church" (Eph. v. 32).

As seen by the eye of God it is "a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." The ideal beauty of "the congregation" of the old Covenant is transferred to the new Israel. Such language would seem overstrained to-day, it was not overstrained then. The baptised did not shrink from such transcendent claims. The metaphors of the Epistles would not have been possible had not the Church recognised their truth. It was a body of which the Spirit of Jesus was the soul. The Church knew itself as One, as Holy, and as Catholic.

The Church and the Churches

But a change was imminent. Before we pass from the Epistles we are aware that the word "Church" begins to be used in new connexions. The fellowship of the disciples ceased in measure to be a visible unity when Antioch became the new centre of the Church's missionary activity. As local assemblies multiplied in different parts of the Empire we find them grouped, and no longer addressed as "the Church," but as "the Churches"; for instance, "the Churches of Galatia," and even "the Churches of Judæa."

As personal supervision by the Apostles became impossible, presiding Elders were appointed, with delegated authority;

such were Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, while James, as "the brother of the Lord," naturally presided at Jerusalem. By a process that was not the less divine because it was perfectly natural, the continuance of a visible external unity gradually ceased to be possible, and there grew up an aggregate of churches loosely held together by a common creed, by obedience to the same Apostolic authority, and by the growth of episcopacy as a centre of unity, but, as Bishop Westcott has pointed out, never in visible union. The Church had ceased to be visibly One, its unity had become a matter of faith.

Other processes, saddening and disintegrating, were at work: when St. Paul wrote to Timothy of the Church as "a great house" in which are many vessels, "some to dishonour," and bids the faithful purge themselves from these, it is clear that already there was "a Church within the Church," and that not all were "Israel" that were "of Israel." As unworthy catechumens were baptised, and unworthy communicants came to the Table of the Lord, we find falsehood at Jerusalem, apostasy in Galatia, fornication at Corinth, and debate and division everywhere, quite as serious as anything we know to-day. Our Lord's words had come to pass: an enemy had sown tares among the wheat. The Visible Church was no longer Holy. From this time all down the Middle Ages there were two conceptions of the Church which never harmonised: a fellowship of God with man independent of all visible organisation, and a great organisation held together by visible and temporal ties like any other human society. The great theologian of the West tried to reconcile these views into one harmonious whole, but even Augustine's dialectic failed.

The New Catholicism

You will not expect me to follow the development of these two conceptions down the centuries, but it is already apparent that to take the terms One, Holy, Catholic, that now properly belong to the mystical Body of Christ, and apply them literally to any visible Church or aggregate of churches, is to empty those great words of meaning and to open wide the door to confusion and error.

Yet that is just what happened. "Two courses," it has been well said, "were open when the three attributes of Oneness, Sanctity, and Catholicity ceased to be part of the living experience of the Church; either to transfer these attributes from the real to the ideal Church, to make them matters of faith to be slowly realised in time and consummated in eternity, or to materialise them, emptying them of ethical meaning, and reducing them to wholly external marks of a visible Institution."[1] It was the second of these courses which was taken by the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. Orthodoxy, the profession of a creed, took the place of spiritual unity, and intellectual assent the place of Christian experience. "The attempt to find the Church of the Creeds in some visible Church or Churches," said the late Professor Gwatkin of Cambridge, "is one of the most disastrous mistakes that Christian men have ever made. When Constantine drew together the Churches of Christendom into a great confederation alongside of the Empire and under its protection, men were dazzled by this majestic image of the Kingdom of God on earth. And if Christ is with the two or three, surely the Spirit of Christ will not be wanting to the hundreds of His ministers who gather to

[1] Rev. C. Anderson Scott. *Evangelical Doctrine*, p. 295.

Ephesus or Chalcedon. So they turned the officials of the confederation into officials of the Holy Catholic Church, found its laws in the decisions of Councils, and verified them by the current belief and customs of the Churches. But what a parody of holy things is this! . . . The entire course of history confirms the measured words of our own Church, that General Councils may go wrong, and sometimes have gone wrong, even in things pertaining to God: and I for one believe that God speaks in history."[1]

The nemesis of a wrong definition is now apparent: it had become possible to be a good Catholic and a bad Christian! A new conception of catholicism had arisen, and Hildebrand did but carry it to a logical conclusion when, in his alleged *Dictatus*, he affirmed that no one is a Catholic who is not in agreement with the Roman Church.[2] Fatal definition! for, whether Hildebrand's or not, it has proved the spiritual undoing of the Roman Church, and, unless rescinded, will some day destroy it.

The Reformation had become imperative. The identification of the Church of Leo. X, Tetzel and Pius V with the Bride of Christ was an outrage on the awakening religious consciousness of Europe. The great reform in the sixteenth century was due not to an individual man, but to the working of spiritual forces already in movement. Before Luther began his work, the power of the Papacy had been broken, and its terrible weapons blunted. When "the Catholic Church," as defined by Hildebrand, with its distinctive products, its organisations and institutions, its worship and its doctrine, was at length arraigned, it was before the bar of

[1] Lecture before the Cambridge Society for the Study of English Church Doctrine, 1910.

[2] Quod Catholicus non habeatur, qui non concordat Romanæ ecclesiæ.

a European conscience already enlightened, and deeply convinced that the final court of appeal to which the great controversy must be taken was not Catholic tradition, but that voice of the early Church which is heard in the New Testament.

In the battle of giants known as the Reformation, the spiritual issues turned upon what is meant by "the Holy Catholic Church." The Reformers—English, German and Swiss—all claimed the title "Catholic" as the proper and true designation of the Protestant Churches. The antithesis you so often hear nowadays between "Catholic and Protestant" has no foundation in history.[1] The great Churchmen to whom in this country we owe the reform of our Church were too good scholars to allow such a contrast for a moment. But, scholarship apart, common sense might answer the question how the Roman Church whose Bishop has broken communion with more than half Christendom, simply because it refuses claims to which he has no conceivable right, can possibly claim the exclusive title of Catholic. No Church in the world has less claim to it, and how any section of English Churchmen can think that they will promote true Catholicity by uniting their Church with Rome, as she now is, passes comprehension! I know how deeply my High Church brethren feel Rome's denial of Catholicity to the English Church, and its repudiation of our Orders. They hold out the olive branch on every possible occasion; "reunion with the Apostolic see of the West" is their avowed hope, and a vain hope. For think of the hopeless condition of the Holy Catholic Church understood as they understand it: two great Churches, the Roman and the Eastern, deny each other's claim to the title, and both

[1] Probably the antithesis meant is that between Catholic and *Puritan*.

deny our own. A third Church, the Anglican, affirms its own Catholicity without denying the Catholicity of the other two. That is charitable, of course, but ask yourself whether, if every barrier to union were broken down to-morrow, we should be the Holy Catholic Church, the Bride of Christ? If two wrongs don't make a right, how can three imperfect Churches constitute the Church of the Creeds? External unity is worth a great deal, I would go far in order to reach it, but external unity is not Catholicity and never can be. The reunion of Christendom is an issue for which we should often pray. Is it possible? I answer, Yes, if Rome and the Eastern Church will follow our example and get back to the doctrine and practice of the New Testament. Then, and then only, will reunion be possible. The ground on which the Reformers affirmed the Catholicity of the Protestant Churches was that they received in their integrity the Holy Scripture as the divine rule of faith and practice, and manifested the fruits of the Spirit in godly living. In so doing they simply re-stated the general position of the early Church and the teaching of Irenæus in particular. It is our own deliberately asserted position, as the Sixth Article proves, and it opens the door to that Home Reunion with the orthodox nonconforming churches which should be our first concern.

Our Church and the Reformation

The Reformers' position, then, is clear: an external unity was never their goal, they declared the unity of the Spirit to be alone real and fundamental.[1]

[1] To those belittling their work I would commend the considered words of the late Archbishop Benson: "I believe," he said, "that it is of immense importance—never more so than now—to recognise that the Reformation of

With that premiss they retained the Catholic Creeds, but corrected their interpretation so as to bring it into harmony with the teaching of Christ and their own quickened spiritual consciousness. They rejected all that on historical grounds was proved to be distinctively Roman, such as the doctrine of the Papacy, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, worship of relics; they kept all that was scriptural and primitive. The worship of the Mass was swept away only that the true meaning and dignity of the Lord's Supper might be restored. Their work throughout was that of "the repairer of breaches," not of the image-breaker. There was no break with the true continuity of the Church's life. In their reconstruction of a positive theology they gave first place to that great doctrine of the Atonement, which through the darkest ages had illuminated the elect souls of monasticism and had been formulated by our own Anselm (A.D. 1033–1109). In the hands of Luther, Calvin, and the English Reformers, this doctrine became the keystone of the new order, the test of a standing or falling church. Ecclesiastically, it restored to the lay people the place and authority given them by the Lord; spiritually, it indicated the real Headship of Christ, revealing Him to sin-laden souls as the immediate source of justification and peace. Can you wonder that the Confessional went the way of the Mass? It is distinctive of Protestant theology that it appeals to direct personal experience and not to mere formulas.

---

the Church of England was one of the greatest historical events—the greatest historical event, I think—in the history of the Church, and that it was conducted by persons of very high capacity, and the very largest knowledge. Cranmer certainly was a most lucid reasoner, and he and his companions, if they had not taken their great stand as reformers, would have been accounted among the greatest Schoolmen that the Church has ever known" (Quoted: *The Churchman*, Feb. 1915, p. 134).

The English Church a Protestant Church

That there should be some important differences between the Reformation here and on the Continent was inevitable. Here it was a movement led by King and Parliament with the co-operation of the Bishops, there it was led by a presbyter. Here the formation of a National Church was a distinguishing motive, and the national principle was a spiritual principle. The English Church is the product of our English character and history, and is as distinctive as any other of our national institutions. It is the more noteworthy, therefore, that between the English and Continental definition of the Church there is no difference whatever. Borrowing its language direct from the Lutheran *Confession of Augsburg*, our Nineteenth Article speaks thus—

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* have erred; so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith" (see additional note, p. 34).

Observe that there is nothing of mere negation in this weighty definition of a Church. It is a direct and positive assertion of the most solemn kind. Protestantism is essentially a positive position. The etymology of the word *pro-testant*, or the act of witnessing *for*, should save us from the common blunder that it simply means witnessing *against* Rome. On the contrary, Protestantism is the assertion of the inalienable right of the individual conscience to all that is his in Christ. And of this right the English Church is

the historical champion within this realm. The Church of England is Catholic because it is Reformed and Protestant.

We cannot afford to be mistaken here, and if some Churchmen are, it is not the fault of their Church. It is probable that more misery has come to Christian men through the spell of a false conception of the Church than from any other single cause. In actual experience it has probably been the most potent of instruments for enslaving the souls of men. In the third century Cyprian said: "There is no salvation outside the Church," meaning the visible Episcopal communion. The Romanist to-day says exactly the same, meaning his own exclusive Church. The modern Anglican, with wider charity but equal confusion, says: "Outside the Anglican, Greek, and Roman communities, which together constitute The Church, there is no security of salvation." Bishop Gore, the honoured spokesman of his school, writes: "Membership in the true Church depends on membership in the visible [*i. e.* the Episcopal] Church on earth." I trust that no word of mine may depreciate the importance of unity, visible unity, or of episcopacy its safeguard, when I say that such statements are alike opposed to reason, to experience, to the Prayerbook, and to the New Testament. The question which tortures thousands of souls to-day, which is the wailing keynote of Newman's *Apologia*, "In what Church is salvation to be found?" is based on fundamental error.

Nor has that error enslaved men's bodies less than their souls, for it has led to effort, repeated again and again, to compel all Christ's flock into *one* fold. Such efforts have always disastrously failed, they always must. Look back over the pages of Church history which tell of such efforts, and you will find that they are more deeply blood-stained

than any other. Think of Simon de Montfort and the Albigenses; of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew; of Philip II, Alva, and the Netherlands; of Mary and the Protestants; of Elizabeth and the Romanists; of Laud and the Puritans; of Charles II and the Scottish Covenanters. Look around you and think of the Stundists of Russia, of the Protestant congregations and their disabilities in Roman Catholic States. Sum up your observations and you will confess that the only visible results of such compulsion are the martyrdom of some, the hypocrisy of others, the sullen resistance of many, and the undying hatred of all.

The Holy Catholic Church

The Holy Catholic Church, then, is not to be found in any particular church, or aggregate of churches; but, if not, she is ideal, mystical, to be apprehended by faith, and that is why she finds her place in the Creeds. That does not mean that she is not real, not visible. The greatest of all realities in this world of passing shadows is the Church, the mystical Bride of Jesus Christ. She is visible in part, and so makes claim upon our belief; innumerable, and so inspires our imagination; holy, and therefore claims our allegiance. Authority, as Professor Gwatkin said, in the sense of demanding our obedience, she has none, for she issues no commands. Officials she has none, for every one of her members is ordained to spiritual service. In short, her oneness is not of earth but heaven, and finds its counterpart in the unity of the Godhead. Her warfare is continuous, but, founded on the rock of a true confession of Christ's Deity, "the gates of hell" do not prevail against her.

"For she on earth hath union
With God, the Three in One,
And mystic sweet communion
With those whose rest is won."

Her members are found in every church, and even outside all churches. The spiritual strength and service of any local or particular church is exactly proportionate to the extent of its inclusion of such persons. She takes us back to the Apostolic rule: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one baptism, one God, and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all." By whatsoever you add to this, by whatsoever you take from it, you mar Christ's Holy Catholic Church. To this Church are made the promises of God: all that the Creeds link with her is her portion—the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of sins, the Resurrection of the Body, aud the Life everlasting.

The glorious time is coming when the Church, "the Church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood," shall be "manifested." For that we watch and work, and "the earnest expectation of the Creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God." Meanwhile, she is "despised and rejected of men," her place of sojourn is the wilderness where she has "a place prepared of God," where her manna is God's word and sacrament, and where she will continue all the days of her exile, even until "the end of the age," and the return of her Lord (see Rev. xii. 1-6).

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I come, in conclusion, to that particular and visible Church which we love and venerate as our own, the Church

which alone has authority and claim upon our obedience as churchmen. Such a claim she unquestionably has. It is the first duty of a Church to put forth authoritatively her Articles of Faith, and to ordain the particular rites and ceremonies that enshrine them; a Church that does not do this is indeed no Church at all. Any of its members who deliberately flouts those distinctive commands has forfeited claim to his title of Churchman.

The Church of England claims *Antiquity*. She traces back her historical succession. Some speak as if she was a new Church at the Reformation. They are mistaken. Some think she was a new Church when Augustine landed in A.D. 596. They are mistaken also. She is the lineal descendant of that British Church which, as early as the fourth century, sealed its faith with its blood in the Diocletian persecution. To one of its martyrs the name of the town, cathedral and diocese of St. Albans is due.

Earlier still, in the decree concerning the Council of Nicea (A.D. 325), special mention is made of the Church of Britain. Earlier still, at the Council of Arles in 314, we find the British Church represented by the Bishops of York, London, and Caerleon; and a century before that Tertullian, the Latin Father, writes: "Regions of the Britons inaccessible to the Romans, have assuredly been subdued to Christ." All this proves the existence of a Church in Britain more than three hundred years before the arrival of the Roman mission under Augustine. At a time when Britain was parcelled out into many kingdoms, there was only one Church with its own uses and liturgy, and its Bishops steadily refused Augustine's demand for its submission to the Roman see. Augustine was a truly great man, to whom we owe much, but devotedly as he worked together with

Paulinus and others, it was not they but Columba and Aidan who were the true apostles of England. Iona, not Canterbury, became the light of Christendom. Not England and Scotland only, but large tracts of the Continent were evangelised by the Irish missionaries, altogether apart from the influence and guidance of Rome. The Presbyter-abbot of Iona, not the Pope, was their head; and when there arose a question as to which they owed allegiance, they unhesitatingly chose the former:—and it was due to him and his, under God, that this country ceased to be heathen, and accepted the name of Christ.

It cannot be too often repeated that for six hundred years the British Church owed no allegiance to Rome, and though for the next thousand years the Church of England was an integral portion of the whole Roman communion, there was always a strong national party strenuously opposed to its claims until they were finally shaken off. It is to their ancient Church in God's providence that Englishmen, whether Churchmen or Nonconformists, mainly owe their Bible, their Christian liberty, their hopes of heaven. You have not forgotten how in 1213, when King John sold his kingdom to the Pope and became his vassal, it was Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, and forty-second of his line, who headed the Barons' revolt, and compelled the unworthy King to seal Magna Charta, the palladium of our national liberties, nor how its first clause runs: "The Church of England shall be free, and hold her rights entire and her liberties inviolate."

Our Church, as I explained, has always held a position of her own, not identical with that of any other Church in Christendom; of this, since the days of Hooker and Field, she has been increasingly conscious; and if you ask me

what that peculiarity is I am content to answer in the words of Dr. Mason: "first and foremost in the intention to be governed by Catholic principles, of which loyalty to the Scriptures is the first, and deference to the practice of the Church of the Fathers is the second." A Bible-loving Church is of necessity a freedom-loving Church, while the historical instinct guards that liberty from degenerating into licence.

Once again, our Church asserts that she is a *National* Church, and has good reason for doing so. It is not, remember, that she was ever established by Act of Parliament, for the Church existed centuries before either crown or Parliament; she was established not by legislative decree, but by evangelistic effort; established, that is, privately in men's hearts long before she was publicly recognised by the State. All that the phrase "by law established" means is that, since the Reformation, her Liturgy and Doctrine, drawn up and formulated by her own divines and scholars, receive the sanction of the State, and that the observance of them is enforceable by law.[1] The case of the "Free Churches" is parallel: their Trust Deeds, drawn up by themselves for the legal possession and succession of their own property and distinctive doctrine, would have no legal authority apart from the sanction of Parliament. Yet who would say that, because they avail themselves of such protection, the State *gave* them such property? But you will readily understand that the ancient Church of this country must be far more closely entwined with our whole social and political fabric

[1] We speak loosely of "the Established Church." The phrase is due to a curious blunder: the Act of Uniformity established *the Liturgy*, as the King's Proclamation declares in its opening words. The Church of England is not by law established. The most zealous Liberationist has never discovered the law that established our Church.

than any church of modern birth. Someone quaintly observed that had Barnabas, instead of giving, legally conveyed his lands to the Church of Jerusalem, the title to them would be vastly more intricate to-day than that to a modern freehold, and so it is with the laws which regulate the National Church as compared with those that regulate religious bodies of recent date. It is due to her ancient endowments held by immemorial title, of which some would rob her for purely secular or political purpose, that the Church makes provision for the spiritual needs of multitudes for whom there is no other provision at all. Disestablishment means disendowment; and disendowment means, in hundreds of poor parishes, the cessation of the means of grace. The chapel often cannot exist where the endowed Church can just hold on.[1] These are not the days for politicians to weaken any Christian Church.

The Gain of a National Church

Speaking of disestablishment reminds me that our National Church secures to us three things—

First, a recognised organ for the acknowledgment by the State of the existence of God, and of the work of Christ. "The union of Church and State," said Lord Eldon, "is

[1] The following extract from a strong Liberationist paper suggests the advantage of endowments from another side: "A man with an income of £60 a year drawn from a few people whom he is bound to please cannot afford to speak his own mind. We have observed such poor men painfully calculating the loss to their income if such and such person were to take offence and leave the place. There are hundreds of Nonconformists who, laboriously treading out the corn, are muzzled and not unmuzzled. And this is our blessed Voluntaryism, and for this we fight against [Church] endowments, and would have them devoted to relieving the rates for sewering and paving!"—*The Christian World.*

not to make the Church political, but the State religious." Well did Dr. Owen, a Nonconformist, say to the Government of his day: "If it comes to this, that you say that you have nothing to do with religion as rulers of the nation, God will quickly manifest that He has nothing to do with you as rulers of the nation." With the terrible warning of German *Kultur* before our eyes, and the moral decay of a great nation that forgot God, these words acquire new significance. These are not the days to disestablish a Christian Church.

Second, a bulwark against the encroachments of Rome, as our Articles and Prayerbook remind us. Were the Church disestablished, her residuary legatee, I am convinced, would be not Nonconformity, but the Church of Rome. Gladly and thankfully do I recognise the real work and piety of the Free Churches so called, and the abundant fruits of their ministry, but confessedly they have neither the antiquity, nor prestige, nor the learning, nor the social position that would enable them to stay the tide of Rome's advance. Sheltered under our lee, they have a freedom of worship and action to-day which would be imperilled to-morrow were our position shattered. When the oak is felled down comes the ivy. The National Church secures, moreover, what every Nonconformist desires, the Protestant Succession to the Throne. What Englishmen have bought so dear, they will do well to keep.

Third, our Church is a great object lesson in *Comprehension*, a constant witness against the narrowness and exclusiveness that prejudices and injures some of the smaller Christian sects. High Churchmen, Evangelical Churchmen and Low Churchmen—she has room for them all. Nor would I have it otherwise, multitudes are thus brought in

her Services within sound of the Gospel who would turn their backs at once were she also narrow and exclusive.

But we do well to remember that even Comprehensiveness has its proper limits. Truth exists independently of men's views of truth. In the Church of England those limits are clearly defined in her Creeds, Articles, and Prayerbook. As I speak to you there is a plan of Prayerbook revision, and I would do nothing save welcome a wise and moderate revision that would bring the book abreast of modern needs, and be loyal withal to the New Testament. But it is no secret that there is a strong latinising party in the Church, disloyal to its Prayerbook and Articles, determined to widen those limits if they possibly can, and, if not, defiantly to overstep them. I hold it, therefore, the bounden duty of every Churchman to know why he is a Churchman, and what his Church holds and teaches, and then with all loyal effort, and in the spirit of charity, to counteract the false doctrines so prevalent and to save the Church of his fathers. What that teaching is on certain very important subjects it is my hope to show you in these Addresses, and may the Spirit of truth and love guide and bless the effort.

Additional Note, see p. 25.

This definition of the Church in her Article is repeated and emphasised again and again. In the Homily for Whit-Sunday "The true Church is an universal congregation and fellowship of God's *faithful* and *elect* people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner stone." In her Collect for All Saints Day she exults in "the mystical body of Thy Son Jesus Christ which is *the blessed company of all faithful people*." And in the 55th Canon she dogmatically defines

the Church thus: "Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church (that is, for *the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world*), and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland and Ireland."

"The Church of Scotland" is a title worthy of notice:— In 1600 James VI of Scotland (not yet James I of England) appointed to some of the ancient Scotch sees Commissioners or "bishops" without episcopal orders, and without any form of consecration. The real introduction of Episcopacy took place in 1610, and the Church of Scotland at the date of the Canon was beyond possibility of question a Presbyterian Church. Note, then, that our Canon calls a presbyterian body "The Church of Scotland."

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

"And He gave some *to be* apostles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and some, pastors and teachers ; for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ."—Eph. iv. 11, 12 (R.V.).

In my opening Address our subject was the Holy Catholic Church of the Creeds, and, springing out of that, I sketched in outline the position and claims of our own National Church. You were shown how we Churchmen are members of a visible Society boasting the most venerable antiquity ; a Church organised under its own Bishops not only before the Reformation, but centuries before Augustine set foot on the shores of Kent ; a Church that existed in this England of ours before either King or Parliament, and that can trace back its descent as far as any Church in the world ; a sound branch of the historic Church, and truly Catholic in its formularies and doctrine.

To-day our subject is closely related. That such a Church should possess an order of men duly set apart for the ministry of God's Word and Sacraments goes without saying. When we remember that in the Divine purpose the Church is not a mere aggregation of individuals, but a living organism, the Body of Christ, to the various parts of which are allotted different functions just as in its human counterpart, we should expect to find such a ministry ordained, and the New Testament shows us its existence and

work from the outset. Our text, translated literally, asserts a close connexion between an efficient ministry and a living Church: "Christ," wrote the Apostle, "ascended that He might give gifts unto men . . . and He gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors who are teachers, with a view to the equipment of the saints for their work of service, for the up-building of the body of Christ." Nothing can be clearer than that: the gift of the ascended Lord is the principle of an ordained ministry, whose business it is to develop the spiritual activities of the entire Body, "for the up-building of the body of Christ." I am conscious that those words have a solemn message both for the pulpit and the pew; we are about to consider the origin and growth of the Christian Ministry, but if we forget amid controversies the intensely practical nature of the subject for ourselves, we should do better to leave it alone.

The Christian Ministry, A.D. 57.

I want you now to turn to 1 Cor. xii. 28, remembering as you do so that the Epistle was written about the year 57, and is therefore some years earlier than the Ephesian Epistle just quoted. You will find a statement here of supreme interest, for, as you will observe, it is at once authoritative, analytical, and contemporaneous; the Apostle is of course describing what the Church recognised as true: "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers; after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."

Examine this statement with care, and you will find that St. Paul, writing some twenty-five years after the Ascension,

claims, first, a divine origin for the ministry; and second, that within that ministry there is a distinct gradation of office, the first three offices constituting the higher rank of the ministry; while "after that," or next in order, come certain administrative functions constituting the lower grade; in two of which, as scholarship tells us, lay the germs of future developments of great importance. You will notice with interest that this division into higher and lower exactly answers to the earliest arrangements made by the Apostles in Acts vi., where they delegated to the Seven the lower ministry of ecclesiastical affairs, reserving for themselves the higher function of preaching the word of God.

You observe, further, that there is no mention as yet of bishops, priests and deacons, the familiar titles of a later day. It is possible that the subsequent appearance of the diaconate is in some way linked with the appointment of the Seven, but it is well to remember that they are not *called* Deacons, and were ordained to meet a special, and it may be temporary, emergency, and that two of their number, Stephen and Philip, soon quitted "the ministry of tables" for the higher "ministry of the Word." It is not till we reach Acts xi. 29, 30, that we are sure of allusion to a distinct order, namely, Presbyters, or Elders.

The truth is that the distinctive forms of the Ministry were generated by the necessities of the Church :—

"We shall form," says Dr. Sanday, "a wrong idea if we think of the growth of the Christian Ministry after the manner of a written constitution in which certain leading principles are recognised from the outset, and carried into detail with topical precision. The Christian Ministry, it is probable, grew, rather than was made, by a process quite simple and natural, though none the less providential." [1]

[1] *N. T. Conception of Priesthood*, p. 58.

To the Jew the term Elder was self-explanatory; to the Gentile it was unfamiliar; and so the Elders St. Paul appointed over the Churches he founded became known as *episcopoi*, or overseers. It is admitted now on all hands that in the New Testament the title *episcopos*, translated "bishop," is interchangeable with that of *presbyter*, translated "elder." They are applied to the same persons,[1] although, while all bishops were presbyters, it is not certain, I believe, that all presbyters were bishops. At any rate, unless "presbyter" and "bishop" are equivalents, there is no instance recorded of an Apostle appointing a man a bishop. The Episcopate sprang from the Presbyterate, not from the Apostolate. If scholarship is sure of anything to-day, it is that. From about the year 70 the history of the Church runs underground in a dimly-lighted tunnel for some fifty years, and when at last it emerges into daylight the presiding Presbyter has become something like the Bishop as we know him in later years.

It is not my purpose now to trace that development. It was extraordinarily rapid, and was no doubt determined by the requirements of the Church, such as the maintenance of Apostolic doctrine, of executive authority, and of cohesion and unity, as her boundaries widened. It is in any case an unquestioned historical fact that within a century of the Apostles we find Episcopacy universally recognised in every portion of the Church, and even in the heretical sects seceding from it. As early, probably, as A.D. 110, Ignatius' Epistles assure us that Episcopacy was a well-ascertained fact of Church order in the many Churches to which he wrote on his way to martyrdom.

[1] See, for instance, Acts xx. 17–28; Phil. i. 1; Titus i. 5.

Our Church's Position Indicated

Much light has been cast upon the whole matter since Stillingfleet wrote his *Origines* in 1662, and it is no slight testimony to the wisdom and scholarship of the compilers of our Prayerbook that such epoch-making writers as Westcott, Hort, Hatch and Harnack do but confirm their position, The statement in the Ordinal: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" remains unshaken after a microscopic inquiry.

Our Church, then, strongly maintains the threefold Order. Perhaps no principle of Church government has been more dear to her than the principle of Episcopacy, or government by bishops. She has never looked upon it as a matter of indifference or of minor importance. To Episcopacy was due the preservation of Christian life and growth amid the storm of early heresies, and the rush of barbaric invasions. For fourteen centuries it remained the normal type of Church government, and when the Reformation of the sixteenth century broke in tempest, political, social, and religious, the English Church, almost alone among the reformed Churches of Europe, maintained Episcopacy amid the welter and confusion of the time. The position of our Church, indeed, is unique in two respects: her "loyalty to Scripture, combined with deference to the use and practice of the early Church, while the God-given faculties of reason and criticism are freely brought to bear upon them both."[1] Sure I am, in the light of recent events,[2] that in

[1] Canon Mason.

[2] I refer to the Kikuyu Communion in 1914, the proposed Federation of African Protestant Churches, and to the Committee on *Faith and Order* now sitting.

Episcopacy we shall some day find the key to that Home Reunion which all Christian men desire, not looking upon it as an exclusive channel of grace, but as a bond of unity. Strange indeed, is it not, that an Order of Ministry which came into being to secure unity, should have developed into a pretext for separation abroad and at home! Some day, please God, that will be changed, and Episcopacy, purged of prelacy and modified in its working by an infusion of democratic principles, will unite us once more.

I said just now that our Church, strong in her Scriptural position, welcomes all light that reason and criticism can give her. That is true, and I want you to test by one and the other some very important claims that are made nowadays in respect to the episcopate and the priesthood; these are the claims of Apostolic Succession for her bishops, and of sacerdotal function for her priests. Let me state these claims clearly, and then examine them with you—

Apostolic Succession

1. With regard to the first, while it is an undoubted fact that at no time since Christ has the Church been without a continuous Ministry, linking (as do the Lord's Day and the Sacraments) the Church of to-day with that of Pentecost, the claim of Apostolical Succession goes considerably farther. It is the assertion on behalf of the English clergy of a lineal descent of power from the Apostles, by virtue of a continued and unbroken succession of bishops in every effectual ordination. It is a tremendous claim, it involves much: it is only right to let the High Churchmen speak for themselves—

Dr. Hook, the well-known Vicar of Leeds, wrote thus in his Church Dictionary—

"The Apostolic Succession is essential to the right administration of the Holy Sacraments. The clergy of the

Church of England can trace their connection with the Apostles by links, not one of which is wanting, from the times of St. Paul and St. Peter to our own."

Dean Goulbourn declared: "There is, and there can be, no real and true Church apart from the one Society which the Apostles founded, which has been propagated only in the line of the Episcopal succession. There is no regular authority or right for the Ministry whatever, but only in this one line," (*Holy Catholic Church*, p. 83). And quite lately Dr. Gore, Bishop of Oxford, has "thought through afresh" the whole subject of the Christian Ministry, to which he devoted a treatise some twenty-five years ago, and in his *Orders and Unity* he sets forth his thesis as follows: "The Catholic principle of Orders is that a man must have received the authorisation to perform whatever ministry he can validly perform by devolution from above," or as stated elsewhere, "by the delegation of authority out of the apostolic fount"—that is to say, not by the free action of the Holy Spirit calling a man through the Church of his own day, but by authority of that same Spirit transmitted through thousands of human links from the original Apostolate.

Now this is a tremendous claim. It is not only the claim of Succession, but of *transmission*. The validity of the Sacraments depends upon their being administered by properly qualified officials, and no man is so qualified unless he has been ordained by a bishop of the Catholic Church. Nay, the very existence of the Church itself is made to hang upon this Succession. To a very large number of our clergy those noble and inspiring words, "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church," mean nothing if they do not mean all

this! I am not surprised to learn that when this dogma of Apostolical Succession was vented in the Oxford *Tracts for the Times*, it was greeted with profound astonishment and considered a Romish innovation.

Assuming, however, that it is true, we shall expect to find that our Church asserts it as she asserts other doctrines; for, if true, it is obviously vital to her position. We examine, then, our liturgy, formularies and articles, and are surprised to find, what Newman was quick to see, that the Church is absolutely silent about any such Succession. Her historical position, her Apostolical Ministry—about these she is emphatic—but she bases her claim to be a true branch of Christ's Church, as you can see for yourselves, not upon any alleged Apostolical Succession, but upon her faithfulness to Apostolic doctrine and practice. Not even in her Ordinal does she hint at such a Succession.

But weightier than the argument from silence is her positive statement in Article XXIII: "Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard." In the Church of England these are by institution, and by usage of the universal Church, bishops. That is all that she is concerned to state, but it is well to observe that, strong in her own unrivalled position, she does not *limit* a lawful Ministry to those episcopally ordained. This judgment of our Church is in harmony with history and experience, for it has pleased God constantly to raise up an effective Ministry of the *Word* apart from such Ordination; and to assert that no Ministry of the *Sacraments* is valid save by those episcopally ordained, when we all admit the validity of lay Baptism, is absurd.

Yet the English Church Union at a recent meeting[1] memorialised the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation as follows: "In accordance with the teaching of the Church in all ages, the Church of England has always taught, and must continue to teach, the necessity of Episcopal Ordination as a condition of exercising the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments." Can it be that these good men had forgotten the joint and deliberate utterance of "the Successors of the Apostles" themselves, who in the last Lambeth Conference assembled resolved: "Anglican Churchmen must contend for a valid Ministry as they understand it, but it is no part of their duty, and therefore not their desire, to go further, and pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the Ministry in other Communions"?

Had they forgotten, too, the words of the learned Professor Sanday, of Oxford—

"It should be distinctly borne in mind that the more sweeping refusal to recognise the non-Episcopal Reformed Churches is not, and can never be made, a doctrine of the Church of England. Too many of her most representative men have not shared in it; Hooker did not hold it; Andrewes expressly disclaimed it; Cosin freely communicated with the French Reformed Church during his exile. Indeed, it is not until the last half of the nineteenth century that more than a relatively small minority of English Churchmen have been committed to it"?[2]

The truth is that not even Bishop Gore can make historical bricks without historical straw, and it seems hardly worth while to say more, unless to point out that this claim

[1] In the Church House, Westminster, Feb. 19, 1914.
[2] *N. T. Conception of Priesthood*, p. 95.

of Apostolical Succession can be tested, and ought to be tested, by its results. If special grace is secured by this Succession, *then special results must follow*—results perceptible to ordinary men, otherwise the mere assertion of them tends inevitably to bring assertors into disrepute.

It lies with those who base their position upon such a transmission of Divine grace to show that their congregations are examples of spiritual living, of unworldliness, of evangelistic and missionary zeal, in a degree that others less favoured cannot emulate. If they cannot do this, what is their theory worth? One thing is historically certain—that Apostolical Succession has never safeguarded the Church from the greatest perils. In the fourth century it did not protect the Church from Arianism, the most deadly heresy that ever reared its head. In the nineteenth century the Roman Church, with its claim of exclusive Apostolic Succession, has not been kept from promulgating the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin (*i. e.* that she was born without sin) and the Papal Infallibility, nor from a ceaseless and wholly unapostolic quest for temporal power.

Another thing you can all judge of for yourselves—I mean the exclusiveness, the mechanical operation, the uncatholicity in actual practice, of this vaunted theory; the Churchman who bases his Churchmanship upon it is logically compelled to regard the Roman Church as a co-ordinate and sister Church. But the Roman Church contemptuously refuses his kiss of peace, denies his Orders, repudiates the Catholicity of his Church. She ignores the whole Anglican Communion; she forbids her members to enter our churches. That, of course, is a very painful fact, but the result to the Anglican is simply this, that the Church which on the other side of

the Channel he venerates as "the Catholic Church," on this side he must treat as the Roman schism, or "the new Italian Mission," as Archbishop Benson very rightly called it. So that a Frenchman at Boulogne is a good Catholic; at Folkestone he is a schismatic! If an Anglican resides at Paris, he is logically bound by his theory to submit himself to the Roman Archbishop, with the unfortunate result that, if he does so, he must renounce his own Church, not merely during his sojourn abroad, but for good and all. I need not stay to further point out how entirely this Succession theory separates the devout Anglican from all those Nonconformist bodies in which undoubtedly the notes of a living Church are manifest. He must treat them, as I am sorry to say he actually does treat them, precisely as the Roman Church abroad treats him. His theory simply sacrifices him on his own altar: its net result is to leave him *isolated in Christendom*, and, worse than that, it isolates the English Church too. A century back the Church of England was in communion with other Protestant Churches at home and abroad. To-day all that is changed. I feel the shame and bitterness of it all, but such is the penalty of a false theory deliberately adopted and maintained. It must eventually break down under its own weight: the doctrine of the Ministry known as "Apostolical Succession" is mechanical in operation, uncatholic in tendency, fatal in result. It is not found in Scripture, there is no trace of it in the Prayerbook, it is incapable of proof, it is the most degrading view of the Ministry ever put forth, it is untrue. I understand that many High Churchmen have relinquished it as untenable in view of modern scholarship, and in its place are content to maintain that "if the English Church is Catholic, a point on which there can be no doubt whatever, there can be no

question about the validity of English ordinations."[1] It seems rather a come down.

The Priesthood

2. I pass naturally, in the second place, to what is closely linked with this assumption, namely, the sacerdotal claims so persistently put forward on behalf of the second order of the ministry.

Let Mr. Bennett, sometime Vicar of Frome, examined before the Ritual Commission, speak for his party—

"Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?"
"Yes."
"In fact, *sacerdos*, a sacrificing priest?"
"Distinctly so."
"Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?"
"Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice."

It is needless to multiply evidence as to this claim, for it is well understood and admitted. It is asserted by some thousands of our clergy; "You should never speak of your priest as a minister or clergyman" is a rebuke not unfrequently heard.

Now the question we have to answer is not whether we like sacerdotalism or not, but whether this claim to sacerdotal function is true or false. That is our business to day, and, believe me, no question is more vital to our whole Church position. Fortunately, we have three Courts of Appeal in this controversy; to each of them we will go—

1. The first is the Bible: and I challenge contradiction when I say that there is no single passage in the Scriptures in which the sacerdotal title is given to the Christian

[1] *The Church Times*, Sept. 4, 1910.

minister, or the term "altar" used in reference to the Lord's Table. I want you to search your Bibles on the point. If English Churchmen knew their Bibles better it would be better both for themselves and for the English Church. "But," says Prebendary Sadler, "it matters not a straw whether the name of priest was given to them!"[1] I admit that the name is of little consequence if you have the thing. Well, have you the thing? There is no greater authority than Bishop Lightfoot; here is his judgment—

"For communicating instruction and for preserving public order, for conducting religious worship and for dispensing social charities, it became necessary to appoint special officers. But the priestly functions and privileges of the Christian people are never regarded as transferred or even delegated to these officers. They are called stewards or messengers of God, servants or ministers of the Church, and the like. But the sacerdotal title is never once conferred upon them. The only priests under the Gospel, designated as such in the New Testament, are the saints, the members of the Christian brotherhood."[2]

Mr. Sadler urges that the power to administer the Lord's Supper and "to absolve" are both sacerdotal functions, and that, therefore, those who did these things under Christ's commission must have been priests. It would have been well if this writer had gone on to show that the Lord commissioned any one to administer the Lord's Supper, or that there is a single instance in the New Testament of an Apostle or any one else having this particular duty. What the New Testament does make clear is that the Church gathered together on the first day of the week to "break

[1] *Church Doctrine Bible Truth*, p. 231.

[2] *The Christian Ministry*. See Lightfoot's *Epistle to the Philippians*.

the bread" in commemoration of the completed Sacrifice of Calvary. If an Apostle was present he necessarily presided, but, even so, the act of "breaking the bread" was not considered his exclusive act, but the act of the whole Church whose executive officer he was. Every Christian communicant has his share in it. The "highest act of worship" cannot be delegated. There is no such thing as vicarious worship: a point that the Eastern Church brings out to this day.

And as to the "power to absolve," based on our Lord's commission: "Whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained:" it lay with Mr. Sadler to prove that those great words were spoken to Apostles alone; and, again, that they mean what he thought they mean; and, yet again, that the gift bestowed was to be transmitted. The whole weight of the best modern scholarship is against him on all these points.[1] In a word, there is nothing in the New Testament that even remotely suggests the possession of sacerdotal functions by any order of Christian ministers.

2. Our appeal, in the next place, is to the early Fathers. My high church friends are fond of appealing to the Fathers, so am I, but let us see that they are *early* Fathers—Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria; appeal to them all, and you will find what Bishop Lightfoot tells you is true—that each of them is absolutely silent as to any claim of sacerdotal powers by a minister of Christ as such. "It is impossible to prove that before the end of the second century the leaders of the Churches were at any time called priests without further

[1] The argument will be found in Westcott's *St. John's Gospel* and *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*, p. 82.

qualifications!" Early in the third century Tertullian pleadingly asks: "Are not we laymen also priests?" He is conscious of the coming danger, and had in mind the great truth affirmed by St. Peter that whether presbyter or layman, every Christian is a priest set apart "to offer up spiritual sacrifices unto God." It is not till we come to Cyprian in the middle of the same century that for the first time we find an unequivocal claim for the Christian Ministry of sacerdotal titles, functions and powers, and these were borrowed, says Bishop Lightfoot, not, as we might have thought, from Judaism, but from the sacerdotal titles and functions of the pagan priesthood of the time. These were on every one's lips, and Christianity took them over.[1] The result was grievous. The seed sown by Cyprian was sown in congenial soil and sprang up with amazing vigour, corrupting the Gospel, shutting out sinners from immediate access to the Saviour, substituting the priest with his altar for the minister of Christ, and penance for repentance, until God raised up Luther and Melancthon in Germany, and Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer in England, to lay the axe to the root of this poisonous tree, and to restore the original conception of the Christian ministry.

3. Our final appeal as Churchmen must be to our own Church—that Church at once Catholic and Apostolic, Reformed and Protestant, the bulwark, so long as her Prayer-book and Articles stand, against Roman aggression on the one hand, and Puritan innovation on the other. The answer of the Church is positive and final. She has much to say about her ministers: she declares a Christian

[1] "It is to Gentile [rather than to Jewish] feeling that this development must be ascribed. . . . It is a significant fact that the first instance of the term 'priest' applied to a Christian minister occurs in a heathen writer."—Lightfoot, *The Christian Ministry*.

Ministry to be "necessary" to the Church, as Baptism is said to be necessary to the individual, namely, "where it may be had." Noble and moving are the words in which Cranmer, in the office for the Ordering of Priests, describes their function, dignity and privilege—"Messengers," they are, "Watchmen, and Stewards of the Lord; to teach, and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep, that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." But of sacerdotal powers there is no mention; the whole emphasis is on the Minister of the Word and Sacraments, on the "pastor, who is a teacher," on the "ambassador of Christ," on the executive officer of the Christian Society.

At the Reformation sacerdotalism was formally and deliberately set aside by our Church, as untrue to Scripture and primitive tradition. If you desire a short proof of what I say, it lies to your hand; procure the volume in "Everyman's Library" entitled *King Edward the Sixth's First and Second Prayerbooks*, turn to the Ordinal printed at the end of the First Prayerbook, and compare it with our own. You will find that instead of the paten and chalice with the significant words: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass, as well for the living as the dead, in the name of the Lord," the Bible alone is placed in the hands of the ordained man, the delivery of chalice and paten being discontinued. Could any change be more significant? The sacerdotal claim was *rejected* and the didactic character of the Ministry insisted on. Yet some Churchmen speak glibly to-day of priest, and altar, and mass, within our Church, and withal claim to be "good Churchmen!" I hope it is mere ignorance. The word "priest" in the

Rubrics is simply the contraction of "presbyter," or elder, and comes immediately from the French word *prestre*, or *prêtre*. It was on this ground that Archbishop Whitgift pleaded for the retention of the word "priest" as applied to the Christian Minister, but in those days people knew the etymology of the word; to-day it is conveniently forgotten, and the word "priest" in the Prayerbook is exploited to enforce an idea of sacrifice which is wholly foreign to it. With equal deliberation, and for similar reason, the word "altar" was removed from the Prayerbook, and in its place "the Lord's Table," or "the Holy Table," was substituted.

In short, to give you once more the unanswered learning of the late Bishop Lightfoot: "The Kingdom of Christ . . . has no sacerdotal system. It interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man, by whose intervention alone God is reconciled and men forgiven," [1] and the Church of England solemnly and deliberately has so ordered her Prayerbook and Articles: at the Reformation everything that expressed sacrifice or sacerdotal function was swept away, and the primitive doctrine restored. The Church of God was brought back to the primitive model.

"The Church of England can only be committed to sacerdotalism," said the learned Dean of Durham, "by stultifying its history, ignoring its formularies, contradicting its greatest divines, repudiating its traditions as a National Church."

As I close, do not forget, I beg of you, that the false assumptions as to the Christian Ministry which I have contrasted with the true doctrine are based upon the deepest longings of the human heart. We do need an altar: God has provided one—we find it at "the place called Calvary."

[1] *The Christian Ministry*, p. 1.

We do need a sacrifice: God has provided one—"the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." We do need a *sacerdos* priest: God has provided one—"a great High Priest, that is passed into the Heavens." Can we say humbly that in Jesus Christ all these needs are truly and fully met in our own case? Orthodoxy is not everything. Unspeakably sad it would be for me, for you, if zealous to maintain Apostolic doctrine in our beloved Church, we were ourselves found "in that Day" to be unsprinkled by the Blood of the One Sacrifice, not partakers of the one Altar, not saved by the one Mediator between God and men; while others, whose doctrine we rightly repudiate, entered without us into the joy of our Lord.

HOLY BAPTISM

"All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—MATT. xxviii. 18–20.

THE first purpose of Christian Baptism is the confession of God, revealed in covenant relation with men as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. To the baptised it is the pledge of forgiven sin, the symbol of entrance upon a new and cleansed life. Moreover, Baptism is the gateway into the Christian Society. From early times we find that God ordained that those joined to Him in faith and obedience should be joined one to the other in one family, brotherhood, or Church, and Baptism is the rite instituted by our Lord for this purpose. Sonship always precedes brotherhood, but sonship is imperfectly realised apart from brotherhood.

Baptism, then, if rightly received, not only admits us one by one into the visible Church, but it is the pledge of our incorporation in Christ's mystical Body, which, as I showed you in a previous Lecture, is partly on earth, partly in heaven. It has to do with membership, as well as with the forgiveness of sins. It is difficult to think of any rite more solemn, more full of hope and promise, and it was never lightly administered in the Early Church. Fitness

for baptism was secured by the catechumenate,[1] and was finally attested by the candidate's public confession of the Faith on the occasion of his baptism. It is interesting to know that the Creeds, which set forth in order the great truths which we believe of the Persons of the Godhead, were probably shaped by these simple baptismal confessions.

But Baptism thus ordained by Christ was not a novel rite, the word and the thing were well understood before Christian Baptism was instituted. Baptisms of various kinds, levitical and traditional, were common among the Jews, and we are told that Gentile proselytes were admitted by baptism into the Jewish Church. When, as the Gospels tell us, John suddenly appeared as the herald of the Messianic kingdom, every Jew understood the meaning of his baptism, and multitudes were baptised of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Christ's first disciples seem to have continued John's baptism for a time, and our Lord in instituting His Sacrament simply took a familiar ceremony, as He did in instituting His other Sacrament, and gave it new and richer meaning. You have heard His command in our text, and the universal practice of Baptism by the Church rests upon it.

The Church's Doctrine of Baptism

The Church is very careful to explain to us the meaning of Adult Baptism: her doctrine is explicit, she tells us what it does and what it does not do, and we ought carefully to study what she is careful to teach. This will be found in

[1] The Catechumen is the candidate for baptism under instruction and discipline. In early days history tells us that the catechumenate sometimes lasted several years.

two of our Articles of Religion, which every clergyman has to sign before he can be ordained—

Article XXV. "The Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him."

Article XXVII. "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

Let us ponder these words: The Church teaches that in the case of Adults the sacraments are first of all *Badges*, or "tokens of Christian men's profession," distinguishing them from others. An unbaptised person has no proper claim to the great name of Christian. In a nominally Christian land like our own we are apt to forget this, but in non-Christian lands every one realises that Baptism is a "mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned (distinguished) from others that be not christened." In such countries Baptism is often won at great cost. In early days of the Church the candidate, facing towards the west, the quarter of darkness, made solemn and personal renunciation of the devil and all his works, and then, after immersion,

turned toward the east, the gateway of the light, and repeated the Creed or symbol of his new faith. Such a man was indeed "buried with Christ in baptism." The past, with its associations, habits and sins, lay behind him, and in simple faith in the Saviour of sinners he stepped forth into "newness of life."[1] There is a very interesting letter preserved to us in which Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in the third century, gives a touching account to his friend Donatus of what Baptism meant to himself on his conversion from heathenism. In the mission field to-day the spectacle of the convert coming from the font, often with the loss of all things, never loses its thrilling appeal.

But the Sacraments are not only badges and tokens, as the Church, mindful of anabaptist and socinian teaching, is careful to remind us, they are "rather . . . certain sure witnesses and effectual signs [*i. e.* seals] of grace and God's goodwill towards us." This is a very interesting point: the sacraments are *Witnesses* because they witness to what Christianity really is. No institutions are more plainly eloquent. They do not depend upon human speech for their interpretation, they carry their own message; the water as naturally suggests cleansing as the bread and wine suggest sustenance. The one sacrament witnesses to the spiritual birth of the soul, the other to its spiritual food. That is why Baptism can be administered but once, the Holy Communion frequently, and as long as life lasts.

They are "witnesses" also to their own divine origin.

[1] Compare such a passage as Romans vi. 1–7, where "knowing this that our old man was crucified with Him" refers, as the context shows, to the moment of Baptism. We who were baptised as unconscious infants find it difficult to understand what Baptism meant to the believing adult in the Apostolic age.

The ancient Churches of Christendom differ from each other in constitution, purity and order; upon some matters of importance they are even openly opposed; but in one matter they are alike, they all possess the two Sacraments of the Gospel, which stand out against the Christian horizon at every point of time or space during the centuries. How does that come about? The question admits of but one answer. If you think of such Churches as so many spokes of a great wheel, radiating from the Church in Jerusalem as from a common centre, you will see that these two Sacraments can only have come to them direct from the Lord of the Church. The very differences and antagonisms of the Churches confirm this judgment. No modern Church dare invent a new Sacrament. No ancient Church like Rome, which has actually done so, can expect to have such sacraments generally accepted. Our own Church, for instance, refuses to accept five sacred ordinances as sacraments which the Roman Church so distinguishes (Art. XXV.), because no one of them is generally necessary to salvation, nor were they ordained by Christ. Thus the two Sacraments are witnesses to their own origin and authenticity, they come to us directly from the Lord Himself; and as one was given just before His Death, the other just before His Ascension, they help to confirm the record of both as historical facts.

Yet again we are taught that they are "*effectual signs*" of grace and God's goodness towards us, that is, they are more than witnesses to the truth of Redemption, they are "a means whereby we receive the same and a pledge to assure us thereof:" in other words, they are a specially appointed means of realising our personal and individual share in the salvation meant for all men. Any one who knows his own heart will at once understand something of the gain that is

to us. The link between the outward sign and the inward grace is guaranteed to us, because both sign and grace are from Christ Himself. The outward sign in Baptism, we do well to remember, is not water, but water used in a certain way; just as in the other Sacrament the sign is not bread and wine, but those elements used "as the Lord commanded," and when so used, when faith answers to promise, they become "effectual signs" [1] and operative as He intended. I need hardly remind you that this does not mean that the Holy Spirit is tied to the use of Sacraments, or that He cannot bless apart from their use, but nothing is more clear than that Christ linked them, as channels of blessing, with the great facts of His redemption, and what He has been pleased to join together we have no right to put asunder.

So far as we have gone, it is not too much to say that Christian men generally are agreed. It is when they attempt to define how God works through the Sacraments that divergence, sometimes of a serious kind, begins. Regrettable though this is, it is far better than a lazy indifference upon the issues involved. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. My aim is to put before you as simply as I can what I believe to be the truth, and such is nothing less than my plain duty in a day of much misunderstanding.

Baptism and Regeneration

Now, that there is a general connexion between Baptism and the washing away of sin stands clear on the face of Scripture. Wherever Baptism is spoken of in the New Testament both the sign and the thing signified, the outward act and the inward moral change, are really implied.

[1] *Efficacia signa*, that is, seals that do seal-work effectually; in other words, become channels of grace.

It would be easy to multiply instances: "Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins;" "As many of you as were baptised into Christ have put on Christ," and the like. The outward act was held to imply the inward grace. That is the general assumption of the New Testament, and the language of the Prayerbook is based upon it. But to say, as the Church of Rome says, that Baptism confers such blessing *ex opere operato*, i.e. without requiring any personal effort on the part of the baptised, is seriously to misunderstand both Bible and Prayerbook, and is detrimental to spiritual religion. You will find that such texts as I have quoted do not stand alone. They invariably have contexts which determine their interpretation, contexts that speak quite plainly of repentance and faith and obedience. Weigh such passages fairly and you will discover that Baptism is not the first thing in the Christian life, but the second; not the primary duty, but the duty that follows. The Church's teaching is perfectly clear upon this point: "What is required of persons to be baptised?" asks the Catechism. And the answer is, "Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament." But Repentance and Faith, I need hardly remind you, together constitute that great spiritual change called Regeneration, or the New Birth; and that no adult is regenerate in Baptism apart from such repentance and faith is the unquestionable teaching of the Catholic Church,[1] as it is of Holy Scripture. It follows, therefore, that Regeneration is the condition of Baptism, and, if so, it cannot be its result.

I admit that the early Church spoke of Baptism as *Regeneration*, but that was simply a name, the language of

[1] See Mozley's Lectures on the Baptismal Controversy.

rhetoric ; you will remember they also called it *Illumination*, but I have never heard that they claimed actual mental enlightenment, apart from the instruction that preceded the rite. There is an invariable tendency, of which we must take watchful account in reading the language of the Fathers upon the Sacraments—the tendency of a superstitious and ill-instructed age—to transfer the ideas that belong to the spiritual reality to the outward rite. It is into this pit that a good many of our own Anglican writers have fallen who claim to be specially true to "Church teaching." I open, for instance, a well-known manual,[1] and read : "The effect of Baptism is this—

1. It remits all sin, original and actual.
2. It bestows sanctifying grace, and endues the soul with the heavenly virtues of faith, hope and charity.
3. It makes the recipient a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven."

In the context "the Kingdom of Heaven" is described as "the Kingdom of the Incarnation," "the realm of grace." A comparison with the teaching of the Church in the Articles just quoted makes comment unnecessary.

I confess, however, that I am moved by sympathy : to this writer and men of his school the moment of Baptism is the best of the whole Christian life upon earth ; then, at the font, for one brief moment the soul was clean before God ; all sin, original and actual, was done away ; then, for once, the sinner stood spotless before the eyes of infinite Holiness, and from that moment the process of defilement inevitably began. I do not wonder at the passionate lament of some of the writers of the Oxford Movement, that their baptismal purity had been lost and their white baptismal robes soiled by the

[1] Mr. Vernon Staley's *Catholic Religion*, p. 243.

world. I do not wonder that they insist on what they call "the sacrament of penance"; in other words, the need of Auricular Confession and Absolution to restore, as far as possible, the primal condition of "the great absolution," their baptismal cleansing, for their best lies behind them.

I think that if I shared this doctrine of Baptism I should be in sympathy with those early Church folk who held similar views and deferred baptism to their death-beds, wishing, like sensible people, to have all their sins blotted out when there was little probability of their committing any more! Chrysostom, preaching from his pulpit in Constantinople, thundered against the common practice. But the bishop's eloquence was useless against the laymen's logic, and baptism was still deferred. A wrong view of Baptism led to erroneous practice. It usually does.

Other Churchmen, unwilling to go the lengths of the writer just quoted, adopt the view that in the act of Baptism a "seed" or "faculty" of Divine life is always implanted. I confess that I am at a loss to explain why such theologians go to the vegetable world for their figure, whereas the New Testament lies to their hand and clearly derives it from human birth. Perhaps it is due to a certain obvious convenience. Should spiritual conversion take place in after years, it is easily attributed to the fructifying of this seed of grace; should nothing of the kind be manifest, it can be regretfully explained that the seed has died before bearing fruit, or that such fruit may yet be looked for in another world. But it has its inconvenience too—I remember hearing of a man who experienced that wonderful spiritual change described in the Bible as the new birth, and went, filled with his new-found joy, to tell his clergyman: "It is the fruit of your Baptism," was the glad and honest

response. "Well, sir," said the man, "I don't know how that can be, for I have never been baptised, and was about to ask you whether I ought not to be baptised now?"

The clergyman's answer showed that he held that Regeneration is the effect of Baptism, whereas both Scripture and Prayerbook teach that Regeneration is the condition of Baptism. That God may be pleased to regenerate in the very act of Baptism no Christian would deny, but that is not the point here, where we are considering the general place of Baptism in the Divine scheme. Had these writers kept to the scriptural figure of birth, they would have been reminded that birth is not the origin of life in the physical world, but the manifestation of life, its entrance upon new conditions and environment. "Baptism," says the Church, "is the seal or sign of a new birth," and there must always be life before there can be birth.[1]

John's Baptism was a "baptism of repentance," not because the rite gave it, but, as Bishop Moule points out, because it sealed the blessings following on repentance; Christian Baptism, in like manner, is called "the washing of regeneration" (Titus iii. 5), not because it gives regeneration, but because it seals its blessings; and this it does formally by the right of Christ's appointment. Knowing full well man's tendency to doubt and unbelief, it has pleased God that the assurance of His salvation should be given to man, not by words only, but by visible signs and seals of conveyance, seals which to the right receiver are

[1] The giving of life is in no sense the thing signified in Baptism, even in a figure, but the leaving the old Adam-life of the flesh, which is typically "buried with Christ in baptism" (Col. ii. 11–12), for the new place and position which is ours in the risen Lord.

effectual pledges of the gift and of His personal love. "The doctrine of the Gospel," writes Mr. Dimock,[1] one of the most learned of modern teachers on the subject of the Sacraments, "is as the written parchment of conveyance. The Sacraments are the signatures and seals, worthless as ink and wax in themselves, but the means of actual donation in their connexion with the Word of the truth of the Gospel. It was part of the great care of the Reformers that sacramental efficacy should be referred to the power of the Word, and not to the Sacraments only, because of their relation to that Word. The doctrine would be maimed and incomplete without the Sacraments. But without the doctrine their efficacy would be gone. The Sacraments in their view are means of grace, because of their relationship to the Gospel and its mighty power."

You will understand now why the Sermon is placed in the Office before the Holy Communion, why the Gospel is read before the administration of Baptism, why the Clergyman is named "a Minister of God's Word and Sacraments."

If you have witnessed with intelligent interest the baptism of an adult, all this will be plain to you. You have heard the candidate make public confession of his repentance and faith, the twin marks of Regeneration or the new Birth, you have listened to the solemn promises of God in His Word, and you have seen him admitted by Baptism into the fellowship of Christ's mystical body, the Church. You have heard the Church, speaking by its Minister,[2] declare him to be regenerate, and handing over, "as by an

[1] *Doctrine of the Sacraments*, p. 19.

[2] In their administration the two Sacraments are the corporate acts of the whole Church, and not of the individual Minister only.

instrument" or deed of conveyance, the title-deeds of his spiritual inheritance, charge him henceforth to walk in newness of life. Church doctrine and Bible truth are one in this matter. The Church teaches a real connexion between the sign and the thing signified, but that connexion is moral and conditional, never mechanical. The efficacy of the Sacrament is not tied to the moment of its administration. That is the great principle of the Anglican Church, as it is of all reformed churches. The language of her Office of Baptism, literal as it is in form, is always conditional in meaning, and the words, "Seeing that this person is regenerate," in the Adult Office are, by the admission of all parties, used hypothetically. In a word, Baptism is useless to a man apart from repentance and faith issuing in obedience. Of this the Church had early proof in the case of Simon Magus; publicly baptised by Philip the Evangelist on his own confession of faith, this man was immediately adjudged by an Apostle to be still "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." He was what the Schoolmen called a *fictus*, baptised but unregenerate. His baptism availed him nothing. If Simon was subsequently "born again" (which tradition denies), then, and not till then, was his baptism complete, a valid sacrament, in which inward and spiritual grace answered to outward and visible sign. We are rational beings, and God's purpose, certified in His Sacrament, demands our co-operation, or He can do nothing for us.

INFANT BAPTISM

If there is one thing that the Sacraments bring home to us more than another it is that Salvation is a gift. That

is seen when the man stands forth before the congregation and, professing his faith in Christ, is baptised; for faith is nothing meritorious in itself, but simply an empty hand stretched out to receive the gift of God. It is still more apparent when the helpless infant, lying in its parent's arms, is placed by father or mother in the arms of Christ's Minister, and the water is poured upon its brow, with the words appointed by Christ Himself. I like to think of what Baptism meant to myself: just when I was most helpless—when, but for the love of home, I should have perished, then it was that the love of heaven stooped to my weakness, and, embracing me in its arms, bestowed upon me the seal of His love. In all our argument about the Sacrament, let us never lose sight of this, that Salvation is God's gift, unmerited, unearned, and that before ever we could come to God, He came to us to assure us of His favour and purpose of grace. Both Sacraments are the pledges of His love. It is an essential part of their value that in a world where men are ever toiling to win and get for themselves, they silently remind us that the most precious thing of all is not won, but offered as a gift.

Infant Baptism was the shape that Baptism took at a very early period. It is possible that it was to some extent practised from the first, but the evidence to which we can appeal is not demonstrative. We may take it for certain that for the first two centuries the prevailing custom was the Baptism of grown men and women. Whenever Baptism is mentioned in the New Testament it is the Baptism of an adult, and this ordinance consequently has always to be studied in the adult, not in the infant. That is due, of course, to the fact that at first the Church was a purely missionary organisa-

tion.[1] When we reach the third century there is ample evidence that a change has taken place. The Christian Family has by this time won its place as the foundation unit in the Kingdom of God, and Infant Baptism has become the rule rather than the exception.

You will not, of course, expect me now to defend the practice of Infant Baptism. I am addressing not Baptists, but Churchmen, and I have argued the question between us and them on a previous occasion.[2] I will merely say that the Church had, as it believes, the mind of Christ in extending the privilege of Baptism to young children. It was, if I may so say, the natural and inevitable result of its historical position. Sprung out of Judaism, it could not fail to be influenced by the fact that by Circumcision the privilege of the older Covenant was extended to young children by express command of God. How then could the child of Christian parents be deprived of a position extended to the Jewish infant? That were indeed to make the new Covenant inferior to the Old! What, too, of the Lord's blessing of the little ones in their mothers' arms? Was that a formal blessing only, or did it carry with it some appropriate spiritual enrichment? Is Christ's blessing ever formal? Can you think of those little ones growing up to lives of sin on whom the Lord had laid the hands of His love? We surely gather, then, the goodwill of our heavenly Father towards such little children and that they are capable of receiving spiritual blessing, a fact to which we hold fast when we present our children to that same loving Saviour

[1] "The Acts of the Apostles" is consequently irrelevant to any discussion between the Baptists and ourselves, a fact that is too often forgotten.

[2] Those who care to study the arguments can do so in my *Infant Baptism*, published by Marshall Bros., Paternoster Row, E.C.

at the font, "nothing doubting," as the Church says, "but that He favourably alloweth this charitable work of ours."

The Grounds of Infant Baptism

It is clear, however, that the Catechism recognises a certain difficulty when it asks: "Why then are infants baptised, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them"—viz. the vows of repentance and faith? It is interesting to notice the different answers given to this question. The Roman Church replies, with Augustine, that an infant's title to Baptism lies in its innocence, for it can oppose no bar to Divine grace. But this, you observe, is a purely negative condition; if it were the true one I do not see why every infant in the world should not be baptised at the earliest opportunity. But even the Church of Rome, with all her errors, does not venture on indiscriminate Baptism. When you remember that only the children of those who "profess and call themselves Christians" are received in Baptism, you will at once see that their claim to membership lies not in themselves but in others, in their parents, or sponsors. This is, indeed, the key to Infant Baptism, and it is in accordance with the whole course of God's dealings with the children of godly parents, from Noah downwards. To lay hold of this clearly is the privilege of parental faith: to act upon it is the secret of the children's blessing. Such a parent is a steward of God's grace to the child, its representative before God, its appointed intercessor. Isaac, for instance, occupied a totally different position from that of the heathen children around: he was accepted of God because of his father Abraham's faith, when as yet he had no faith of his own. So in the New Testament the children of a Christian father or mother are

described as "holy" (1 Cor. vii. 14) because they are in a certain vital contact with the Holy One through their believing parent: it is in the name of such children, not of any children, that the sponsors make promise at the font.

If you ask, How can any one promise for another these things of the Spirit? the answer is, of course, only in a reasonable and practical way, by undertaking that he shall be the child of many prayers, and that "as soon as he shall be able to learn" he shall be instructed in the Christian faith. In a word, sponsors representing the Church guarantee his Christian training, and only on that understanding he is baptised.

The Blessings of Baptism Conditional

The words of Dr. Wall, who was thanked by Convocation in 1705 for his *History of Infant Baptism*, are to the point here: "I say it appears to have been the meaning of the Church in that question and answer ('Why then are infants baptised?') not to determine whether infants are to be baptised, but to determine whether infants that are baptised are baptised upon any other covenant than that upon which grown persons are baptised, namely, that of repentance and faith. And it determines that they are not baptised upon any other, but the very same; with this difference, that the adult is baptised into the hope of the Kingdom of Heaven in which he does believe, an infant is baptised on condition that he do, when he comes to age, believe."

"We can make no comfortable use of our Baptism," wrote Archbishop Ussher, one of the greatest saints and scholars of the English Church, "until we believe."[1]

[1] Sponsors are not necessary to the efficacy of Baptism. In the private service for infants supposed to be dying there are no sponsors. Their appointment,

The legal instrument known to lawyers as an *escrow* illustrates this well. An *escrow* is a deed of gift, duly signed and sealed, and in it is an agreement that the gift shall not pass to the grantee until a certain condition be fulfilled. In words, the gift is immediate, but until this condition is fulfilled the gift cannot pass to the person for whom it is designed. So soon as the condition is fulfilled, then without any further signing or sealing the instrument takes effect, and the gift passes to the grantee. Up to this time there is title only, and not present possession. "Yet title is much," says Bishop Moule; "the holder has something (and a very important something) at once. He does not grasp a shadow. He receives a beneficial title, right and pledge, the possession of which entitles him to special care and attention."

But while I say this, do I mean that the Holy Spirit cannot regenerate an unconscious infant—God forbid! The Baptismal Office is a call to faith to exercise itself in view of Christ's appointed Sacrament: "Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will likewise favourably receive this present Infant . . . that He will give unto him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of His everlasting Kingdom."

The child therefore receives its "new name" as did the Jewish child at the time of circumcision, and is baptised into the Name, the Covenant Name of God, and the Church puts into the Minister's lips the language of faith: "Seeing now that this child is regenerate." These words, positive as they seem in form, are, like the equivalent words in the service of adults, hypothetical in meaning, as their

---

therefore, in ordinary cases to secure a Christian training convincingly indicates that the Church holds that the blessings of Baptism are conditional on the performance of the promises made at the font.

history proves,[1] and Archbishop Ussher's caution is not to be forgotten: "Though we, in the judgment of charity, do judge this of every particular infant, yet we have no ground to judge so of all in general; or, if we judge so, it is not any judgment of certainty, we may be mistaken." It was in precisely this spirit of charitable presumption that our Lord bade His disciples: "Into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house, and if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it; if not, it shall turn to you again." It was in this same spirit that St. Paul wrote of all Galatian Christians what was certainly only true of some: "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ." Our Prayerbook is written throughout on the high presumption, the charitable supposition, that every baptised person is good and holy, and no other method is feasible in such a book.

Let me urge the importance of this fact being carefully recognised. Without this, the key of interpretation is lost, and views that are neither Primitive nor Catholic, but simply medieval, are put forward as "the Church view," and work untold mischief. Good, but mistaken, clergymen set forth "the Prayerbook doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration," yet have not a notion of what that doctrine really is. A theory of one of the most stupendous of God's works—the New Birth—which neither harmonises with the New Testament nor with observed facts, is lowering the spiritual life in many a congregation. It is losing to the old Church numbers of her most spiritual children, who are driven into dissent

[1] When the Baptismal Office was compiled, "Seeing that" was recognised as a conditional formula. Johnson's Dictionary gives as its equivalent the French *pourvu que*, "provided that," "on the understanding that." It is frequently so used in the New Testament (Authorised Version). The Additional Note, p. 74, should be carefully weighed.

because they are assured that this, forsooth, is "Catholic truth," and "Church teaching," whereas it is equally remote from one and the other.

Infant Baptism and Confirmation

It is worth noticing that the Catechism and Confirmation Office demand the interpretation of Infant Baptism that I have tried to enforce. It is not until the "years of discretion" have come that the baptised is called upon to verify and confirm his baptismal vows. When adult baptism was the rule, and long afterwards, the laying on of hands was practically a part of baptism, but rightly and wisely the Western Church was guided to put an increasing distance and a period of careful instruction between them, as if to guard against an unintelligent and formal rite.

The Catechism, then, is written throughout from the standpoint of a sincerely Christian child; one "virtuously brought up" to lead a godly and a Christian life; one who eagerly answers, "Yes, verily, and by God's help so I will," when challenged to keep the promises made for him in baptism; one who has "received forgiveness of all his sins;"[1] one who says, "I heartily thank God that He hath called me to this state of salvation." There is no mistaking this portrait; and now, facing the high and sacred responsibility of a public confession of Christ, this young Christian traces back his spiritual history to his baptism, "wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor (*i. e.* present possessor) of the Kingdom of Heaven."[2] He realises that

[1] Confirmation Office.

[2] Observe the Church says "wherein," not *whereby*. The difference is important. Whereby (*by means of which alone*) would imply that the act of

every spiritual blessing that is his was "estated" and assured to him by the solemn seal of Christ's sacrament, and that what is now an actual experience was sacramentally his from the outset.

I would that all doubting Churchmen could have shared with me the study of this historic portion of their Prayer-book. Their doubts would have been set at rest; they would have found that, not the language of the Office, but their own interpretation of it, had been at fault. They may rest perfectly certain that a service compiled by the men to whom chiefly we owe the blessing of the Reformation is not merely purged of medieval error, but is the outcome of profound and sanctified learning.

I want to urge more than this. I long to see such brethren not merely sanctioning, but throwing their hearts into this Scriptural and very beautiful service. If its language be the utterance of Faith, let them see to it that they employ that language with faith. If Hope and Love lie at the foundation of its glowing anticipation, let them seek more of these heavenly gifts in the using of it. Above all, I bid them mark well the element of Thanksgiving which permeates the whole: "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth Me." The Baptismal Offices were constructed in full and joyful view of a rediscovered New Testament, of truths long

---

Baptismeffected Regeneration, the new birth not being conditional on any subsequent fulfilment by adult or child of the baptismal vows. This is Mr. Staley's position, whose language (quoted above) is practically identical with that in Henry VIII's *Necessary Doctrine*. Wherein (*in connexion with which*) implies the fulfilment of such conditions, and brings the Catechism into harmony with the N.T.; *e.g.* Col. ii. 11, 12: "Having been buried with Him in baptism, *wherein* ye were also raised with Him *through faith* in the working of God," *etc.*

obscured, more especially the Fatherhood of God, the completed Atonement of Jesus Christ, and the constraining Love of the Spirit. It is just when we stand spiritually and experimentally nearest to our compilers that we shall best interpret their feelings and understand their words.

Additional Note. See p. 71.

Canon Mozley writes (*The Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration*, p. 152)—

"The asserted regeneration of the whole body of the baptised in our Prayerbook is but the continuation of the asserted righteousness of the holy nation in the Old Testament, and the asserted glory of the Christian Church in the New. *The assertion in our formularies is the hereditary representative of an old assertion pervading all Scripture.* Is that assertion of Scripture, then, a literal or hypothetical one? If the latter, then is the one in our formularies hypothetical too. *The term 'regenerate' comes down to us with a particular meaning stamped upon it which we cannot remove, according to which meaning it cannot possibly be asserted literally of all baptised persons.*

"This is, therefore, an hypothetical assertion. A bias in favour of a literal interpretation operates as an obstacle to sound interpretation instead of an assistant to it, if it induces us *to invent a meaning for a term which it never had, in order that by help of such a meaning we may produce a literal interpretation.* And worse still does this bias for literal interpretation operate, when it leads, as it does in the present instance, even to its own total and conspicuous frustration: when it carries us to the most flagrant and obvious distortion of the natural meaning of words; when it makes us, for the sake of literal interpretation, neglect and violate literal interpretation, and understand the words regenerate, dead to sin, risen with Christ, new creature—terms obviously implying real holiness and goodness—as meaning only a capacity for these dispositions."

Canon Mozley, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement, was at one time strongly opposed to the interpretation he here insists on. A candid and singularly able man, his studies led him to the position of the Reformers on this question.

HOLY COMMUNION

FIRST LECTURE

"And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave unto them, saying, This is My Body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in My Blood, which is shed for you."—LUKE xxii. 19, 20.

UPON no subject are Churchmen more painfully divided than upon the Supper of the Lord. Our Reformers laid down their lives to uphold the primitive doctrine, and yet to-day—I say it with deep regret—it is only too obvious that we of the National Church are almost hopelessly divided about it.

It is this question, as you all know, which separates us from the Roman Church more decisively than any other. This is due, not merely to the importance of the Sacrament, but to the fact that there is no Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. Each Church has to define its own doctrine, and so far every definition has failed to bring about agreement of the Churches. Our own Church sets forth her position with singular clearness, as I hope to show you, and whatever subjects we can afford to be neutral about, the Lord's Supper is not one of them. Vague and mysterious language on the Sacraments is leading to very serious results, and you rightly expect me as your clergyman to afford you what direction I can.

At the outset let us thankfully remind ourselves that the

inspired documents which contain the narrative, the historical facts, of the Institution lie to our hand. This is an unquestionable advantage. Our discussion is not one that turns upon some ancient manuscript locked up in the libraries of Constantinople or Alexandria. The sources of information are equally accessible to us all. The nature and design of the Lord's Supper are stated with seemingly absolute clearness in the four accounts of its institution as we find them in the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and (first in order of date) in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Putting these together, they read thus: "The Lord Jesus, the same night that He was betrayed, as they were eating, took bread, and gave thanks, and blessed [God], and brake it, and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body which is given and broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner, also, He took the cup when He had supped, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is My Blood of the New Covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins. This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me, for as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show ('ye proclaim,' R.V.) the Lord's death till He come."

"This is My Body," etc.

The purport, however, of these words, or at least of some of them, is disputed, and the question is simply this: What is the meaning of Christ's word, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," and how are we to feed upon them?

In considering these questions, I shall venture to lay down three propositions for our guidance—

1. The first is this, *We must take our Lord's words*, "*This is My Body*," *in the most literal and obvious sense they will bear*. We may be thankful that on this canon of interpretation, Roman and Anglican, evangelicals and sacerdotalists, are perfectly agreed. Dr. Pusey says, "All things combine to make us take our Lord's words solemnly and literally." Archdeacon Wilberforce says, "That our Lord's words of institution were to be taken in their simple and natural sense, was the belief of all ancient writers."

Two quotations from the decrees of the Council of Trent will suffice to set forth the Roman view—

"If any one denieth that in the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially, the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but saith He is only therein symbolically, figuratively, or virtually, let him be anathema."

And again, "Christ, whole and perfect, is under the species of bread, and under every particle of it; and whole under the species of wine, and every particle of it." In other words, "This *has under its species* My Body," is the Roman explanation of "This is My Body."

Two quotations will similarly show what is the new 'Anglican' view. In the "Little Prayerbook" is this direction: "At the words, 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' you must believe that the bread and wine become the real Body and Blood, with the soul and Godhead of Jesus Christ; bow down your head and body in deepest adoration when the priest says these awful words, and worship your Saviour then verily and indeed present on His altar" (p. 18).

Hear next what the English Church Union affirm in

their solemn Declaration in the year 1900, viz. "That in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the Bread and Wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become, in and by consecration, according to our Lord's institution, verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ, and that Christ our Lord, *present* in the same most holy Sacrament of the altar *under the form of* Bread and Wine, is to be worshipped and adored."[1]

To put their view in a sentence, "This is My Body" means "This *has under its form the presence of* My Body."

Placing our Lord's words and those of these interpreters one below the other, we find they read thus—

Bible.....	This	is	My Body.
R.C....	This	*has under its species*	My Body.
Neo-Anglican	This	*has under its form the presence of* ...	My Body.

I hardly think that either of these interpretations could have occurred to you as the obvious equivalent of the substantive verb "is"—and we shall presently find that the most literal meaning the Divine words will bear condemns at once both the Roman and the modern Anglican interpretation.

2. We can now advance a step further—My second proposition is this: *We must take* all *the words Christ used if we would understand them aright.* The full words are, "This is My Body which is given for you," "This is My Blood which is shed for you." Mark those words, "which is given for you," "which is shed for you," for much depends upon them.

[1] *Church Union Gazette*, July 1900, p. 202. Italics are mine.

Now the Roman priest in consecrating the bread, says only: "Hoc est enim corpus meum" ("This is My Body"); and Bellarmine, in his treatise on the Eucharist, has a chapter on these words, in which he takes no notice of the rest of the sentence. Luther, in like manner, built his argument at Marburg on these words only, writing them, as you recollect, on the table before him. The same thing may be said of the majority of modern High Churchmen—Archdeacon Wilberforce, for instance, in his well-known book, *Doctrine of the Eucharist*, practically omits (as the learned Dr. Vogan points out) just what the Roman Church and the Lutheran Church omit: "Let any one," he says, "who is in possession of the book, take and blot out every place in which the words, 'Which is given for you,' 'Which is shed for you,' are recited, and he will find that they have not the least influence upon the argument and the doctrine which it is used to enforce." What, however, is the result of this omission? Simply this: that the Roman Church, the Lutherans, and the High Churchmen all fall into the error of taking "This is My Body" to mean "This is My *glorified* Body." The Romanist defines the body in the Sacrament as "His true Body which was broken for us, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, and is to die no more"—in other words, Christ's *glorified* Body. Dr. Pusey says, "Why should we think it too strange a thing for His marvellous condescension that He should now give us His blessed Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine, or how should His Body which He gives us not be His living, life-giving Body?" So, again, Archdeacon Wilberforce thus argues the presence of our Lord's Body to be possible: "Our Lord's human Body," he says, "is not subject to the laws of material

existence, because His Body is a *glorified* Body, which has new qualities gained by oneness with Deity." In other words, it is Christ's *glorified* Body.

Again, let us put under each other our Lord's words and these varied interpretations of them :—

Bible.....	This	is.....	My Body which *is given* for you.
R.C.....	This	has under its species.....	My *glorified* Body.
Lutheran.....	This	has with it	My *glorified* Body.
Neo-Anglican	This	has under its form the presence of ...	My *glorified* Body.

Plainly, therefore, whereas Christ referred to His Body as about to be crucified, the views before us refer to it as glorified, and do so by deliberately deleting, or, at least, by omitting to assign any meaning to the words, "which is given for you," "which is shed for you."[1] We are fully justified in contending that, taking *all* the words of the institution, the Bible gives no support to the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation on the one hand, or to the new Anglican theory of Consubstantiation on the other.

3. Our third proposition is as follows: *That the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of our Lord now in the same sense in which they were His Body and Blood on the night of institution.* This is obviously important, and I will give you a few quotations in support of it—

[1] Hence the significant practice among the High Church clergy of omitting he words, "which was given for thee," "which was shed for thee," as they administer the bread and wine respectively. Notice that in these words our Church uses the past tense.

St. Augustine says: "He gave to the disciples the Supper consecrated with His own hands, but we have not sat down to that banquet, and yet we daily eat the Supper itself by faith. Paul was not there who believed, Judas was there who betrayed. How many now, too, in this same Supper, though they saw not then that table, nor beheld with their eyes, nor tasted with their mouths, the bread which the Lord carried in His hands, yet, because *it is the same which is now prepared*, how many also in this Supper eat and drink judgment to themselves!"

St. Chrysostom writes: "This Table is the same as that and nothing else." And again, "The first Table hath no advantage above that which cometh after."

This, indeed, is one of our most cherished and fundamental privileges in that sacred feast, that "it is the same as that and nothing else," nothing less and nothing more. Handed down to us all through the long-drawn ages of the Church's life, it is still substantially the same as that instituted by our great Head Himself. Destroy this assurance, and what have we left? But I say confidently that if the Roman and so-called Anglican doctrines of a Real Objective Presence be true, then the Lord's Supper now is *not* the same as that, it is something essentially different. Both these doctrines, I repeat, assert the Presence in the elements to be that of Christ's *glorified* Body. If so, then assuredly it is not the same Supper, for Christ's Body was *not* yet *glorified* on the night of institution. Is it, then, His crucified Body? But neither was Christ's Body yet broken for our sakes. Is it not obvious that Christ's Body as glorified and Christ's Body as crucified *were not* at the time of institution? There can be no substantial presence of that which *is not*.

The Only Interpretation

So far, then, for my task. Our analysis of the Roman, Lutheran and new Anglican interpretation of "This is my Body" shows that they are in conflict, while no one of them conforms to the three simple propositions I laid down for our guidance. What hope, then, is there of arriving at any positive conclusion? What light have we on the meaning of the words?

Are we to say hopelessly with Mr. Sadler that "we must leave them where Christ left them—in impenetrable obscurity"? So far from that being the case, I maintain there is no obscurity at all; the time, the circumstances, the words themselves are illuminating, and we can explain their meaning without the smallest presumption or hesitation. For scholars point out that our Lord, Who had just kept the Passover Feast for the last time, used the form and ritual of that Feast in instituting His new Ordinance. He took over and adapted them to His purpose, just as in instituting Christian Baptism He took a ceremony familiar to every disciple. It is God's way to speak to man's intelligence, and to use an alphabet he understands.

Now the invariable custom of the Passover Feast was for the head of the household to take the flat passover cake, to bless God, and then to break and distribute it with the words: "This is the bread of affliction which our fathers did eat in the land of Egypt." What did those present understand by these words? Unleavened bread will keep a long time, I know, but it will not keep 1500 years. In the liturgical formula, then, the substantive verb "is" meant "represents."

You see at once that when our Lord took over the familiar words they carried the familiar and natural meaning,

and "This is my body which is given for you" meant, and could only mean, "This *represents* my Body" given for you. The words that immediately followed, "This cup (*i. e.* the wine) is the new covenant in my blood" confirm this absolutely, for there every one admits that "is" signifies "represents" and nothing else. Why confuse everything by insisting on a particular meaning of "is" in the first half of our Lord's words, when that meaning is impossible in the second half?[1]

It might seem incredible that with so simple and obvious an interpretation guaranteed to us, men should have split hairs for centuries, reading into "is" the metaphysical mysteries of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, as if either one or the other had the remotest connexion with our Lord's meaning.

We certainly understand, then, that the bread in the Sacrament "is" our Lord's Body in the sense that it signifies or represents that Body as broken and separated from the Blood, the wine represents in like manner that Blood as it was shed and separated from the Body. Together they set forth His sacred Body not as glorified (a thought foreign to the occasion), but in the condition of death, and that a violent death, for us men and our salvation. "It seems to me vital," wrote Bishop Westcott, "to guard against the thought of the Person of the Lord in or under the form of bread and wine. From this the greatest

[1] If it is still asked why our Lord used the substantive verb "is" when He might have said "represents" and made controversy impossible, the answer is plain: the old Hebrew and Syriac have no word answering to "represents" or "signifies," and used "is" for the purpose (see Gen. xli. 26, 27; Dan. vii. 17, 24. Compare Gal. iv. 24, 25; Rev. i. 20), and He could not have expressed Himself otherwise. If He spoke Aramaic, the "is" was not even expressed, but understood.

practical errors follow. The elements represent His human nature as He lived and died under the conditions of earthly life" (*Life and Letters*, ii. 352).

Mr. Sadler finds fault with this view because it practically divests the Sacrament of all mystery.[1] That is precisely what it does not do; every devout Christian will acknowledge the mystery, but then he sees where the mystery lies, not in any change in the elements due to consecration (a view rejected by such typical Anglican divines as Hooker, Overall, Cosin and Andrewes),[2] but in the spiritual intercourse and communion between Christ and His people which is specially pledged to us in this Sacrament. The idea that the action of the minister in consecration effects, at a given moment and place, the Real Presence of the glorified Christ is repugnant to a devout mind, and it involves the further conception of His Real Absence until such consecration, and constitutes a denial of His plain teaching about the manner of His Presence since the Ascension.

It is in exact accordance with the doctrine I have enunciated that the Church speaks. "Hear the Church," we are told: well, "they that have ears to hear, let them hear" the three solemn Articles which set forth—

The Church's Doctrine of Holy Communion

XXVIII. The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly,

[1] *Church Doctrine Bible Truth*, p. 125.

[2] See Bishop Dowden's analysis of the teaching of these and other authorities in the *Guardian*, August and September 1900.

worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

XXIX. The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ : but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

XXXI. The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual ; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

To this add the teaching of the Catechism—

Q. Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained ?

A. For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the

Death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.

Q. What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?

A. Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

Q. What is the inward part, or thing signified?

A. The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

Q. What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?

A. The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine.

Q. What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?

A. To examine themselves, whether they repent them truly of their former sins, stedfastly purposing to lead a new life; have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of his death; and be in charity with all men.

Bible Truth Church Doctrine

The Church's teaching is clear, and true to primitive doctrine. Notice carefully its main features: It expressly negatives Transubstantiation or "a change of being in the elements" due to consecration.[1] With equal clearness it excludes the thought that there is a sacrifice in the Holy

[1] The difference between Transubstantiation, the Roman view, and Consubstantiation as set forth in the E.C.U. Declaration (see p. 79) is verbal only.

Communion in any propitiatory sense whatever, sharply distinguishing between the Sacrament, or sign, and the thing signified. So far from teaching that the elements are "a memorial offered before God," we are taught that the Sacrament was "ordained for a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby"; it is *we*, not He, who need to be put in remembrance, for it is we, not He, who forget. If you ask me: Do we not plead the merits of Christ's Death in the Sacrament? I reply, Most certainly we do. There is no act of worship in which we draw nigh to God "through Jesus Christ our Lord" so consciously as in this precious memorial of His dying love, but that is not the act of a sacrificing priest, but of the individual worshipper deep in the silence of his heart.

I say again, observe how clearly and positively the Church speaks:—It is they only who have "a lively faith" who "in any wise" partake of Christ in the Holy Communion. There are two givers at this Feast: the minister who gives to our senses bread and wine, and the Holy Spirit, who gives to our faith the Body and Blood of Christ. The believer receives both; those "void of a lively faith" receive one only, viz. "the sign or sacrament of so great a thing," and that to their condemnation.[1]

Well does Hooker say: "The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." I admit that we speak in a loose way of "receiving the

[1] It is a fair question what becomes of "the Presence of our Lord's glorified Body in, with, and under the consecrated elements" in the case of an unworthy receiver? And what of the glorified Blood, of which we practically hear nothing?

Sacrament," but it is inaccurate: the consecrated elements are not the Sacrament, nor the Sacrament the elements, for the word "Sacrament" implies both "the outward visible sign and the inward spiritual grace." Listen to Waterland, a representative Anglican, whose treatise on the Eucharist is classical. Writing in 1737 on the words of the Catechism just quoted, he says: "The Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful not corporeally, not internally, but 'verily and in deed,' that is *effectually*. The sacred symbols are not mere signs, or untrue figures of a thing absent, but the force, the grace and the virtue of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed, that is of His Passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the Real Presence that our Church teaches." [1]

We are now in a position to speak positively as to the meaning of our Lord's words: "This is my Body given, this is my Blood shed, for you." The consecrated elements are still bread and wine, as they were still bread and wine after He had blessed God and broken and given in "the upper room"; but to us who, "rightly, worthily, and with faith" receive them, they are "a means whereby" we receive Himself, the once crucified, and now ascended Lord, "and a pledge to assure us thereof."

How different all this is from the spectacular sacrifice of the Mass with its vested altar, cloud of incense, apparelled priest and studied genuflexions, as seen in a large number of our English churches, with a non-communicating congregation, and the words of administration garbled! I honestly

[1] This teaching is identical with that of Archbishop Cranmer, who had a large share in the Reformation and in the construction of the Articles. (Cranmer's *Works on the Lord's Supper*. Preface. Parker Society. 1884.)

believe that the Tractarian party in its latest developments would have denounced this new Anglicanism as so much disloyalty to the Church. Bishop Samuel Wilberforce certainly did so in his last Charge. But these practices will continue just so long as the doctrine from which they spring is held, viz. as set forth in the Declaration of the English Church Union already quoted.

A New Anglican Doctrine

I repeat that doctrine is novel. It was introduced into our Church, says Canon Meyrick,[1] by Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce in his *Doctrine of the Eucharist*, a book drawn from Roman sources and published shortly before he joined the Roman communion. That it spread fast in England and in the Scotch Episcopal Church can only be accounted for by the general ignorance of primitive doctrine and of the Church's teaching. By no possibility can it be squared with the teaching of the Prayerbook, and I am not surprised to be told that the Communion Office badly needs altering in the direction of the Canon of the Mass, and that by the very people who adhere to the Declaration aforesaid and assert withal a special loyalty to the Church.

The words of one of the greatest modern liturgical scholars, Bishop Dowden, deserve to be weighed: "One thing is absolutely certain. It is no part of the doctrine of our Church that there is an adorable presence of our Lord's body and blood *in* and *under* the forms of bread and wine. Such language is undiscoverable in the doctrinal standards of our Church, and wholly unknown to the Church of the early Fathers" (*Define your Terms*, p. 21).

[1] *Scriptural and Catholic Truth*, p. 269.

The Declaration of the E.C.U. and the words of the Bishop both belong to the year 1900. Both cannot be true, which of them is false? If you have followed these Lectures I trust that you can answer the question for yourselves, and you will be disposed to agree with the measured criticism of the late Dr. Ince, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford: "The truth is that the Declaration of the E.C.U. is at variance with the doctrine maintained by the consensus of all the most eminent theologians of the Church of England since the Reformation, nor can it be reconciled with the natural interpretation of the English Liturgy or the 28th and 29th Articles. It is a deliberate attempt to undo the work of the Reformation, which delivered our Church and Realm from the tyranny of the many accretions of false doctrine which the Church of Rome had imposed upon Christians as necessary articles of faith, but which the Church of England declared to be unsanctioned by Scripture or by the teaching of the primitive ages of the Church" (*The Doctrine of the Real Presence*, p. 28).

HOLY COMMUNION

SECOND LECTURE

In my last Lecture we carefully weighed the meaning of the solemn words: "This is my Body." To-day we must consider the remaining words of our Lord's institution—

"This do in Remembrance of Me."

If it is impossible to avoid the controversy that surrounds them, it is satisfactory to know that, provided the conclusions reached up to this point are sound, there is nothing in the words before us to create difficulty. They are as simple as the others. "This do," said the Master, "in remembrance of Me." The simplest and most natural meaning is the true one. On the eve of His Passion He shared the desire of every true human heart not to be forgotten: "Do not forget Me, my disciples; Do this in remembrance of Me."

It is surely part of the nemesis which dogs error that our High Church friends, having committed themselves to a wrong interpretation of "This is my Body," feel compelled to support it by two other interpretations equally wrong. They teach that "Do this" means "Sacrifice this," and that "in remembrance of Me" means "for a memorial of Me before God"! Dr. Pusey said so, and others less eminent echo his teaching. "Dr. Pusey may say so," exclaimed Bishop Thirlwall, the best classic of his day, "but he must

not expect any Greek scholar or any sound theologian to agree with him." The fact is that Do is as colourless in Hebrew and Greek as it is in English, and depends for its meaning on its context. Tell a boy, "Do a sum," and it means one thing; bid him "Do some toast," and it means another. Here then, as usual, the context decides the meaning. "Do *this*," said our Lord, and all the Greek Fathers (who may be credited with knowledge of their own language) treat the words as meaning "Perform this action," "Do as I have done"—and it is in "doing this" that we remember Him. The context forbids any thought of offering or sacrifice.[1]

Our Prayerbook, moreover, enforces this interpretation. Four times in the Office reference is made to Christ's words, and each time in the sense of the familiar words: "And to the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood shedding He hath obtained to us; He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort." When it is further alleged that "in remembrance of Me" means "for a memorial of Me before God," we are entitled to ask where does the Greek word for "remembrance" (*ἀνάμνησις*) ever mean that which puts some one else in mind? Grimm's Lexicon (and there is no better authority) enables us to say: Nowhere in

[1] Canon R. B. Girdlestone, a great Hebraist, points out that our Lord used Do in a technical sense, for in both Hebrew and Greek "keeping" the Passover is "doing" the Passover; *e. g.* in Matt. xxvi. 18, "I will do the Passover at thy house with my disciples." But to "do" the Passover was a purely domestic function and involved no sacrificial or sacerdotal act: "All the congregation of Israel shall keep [do] it" (Exod. xii. 47).

the New Testament.[1] The word always means a *remembering* or *recollection*, and Grimm translates our Lord's words: "Do this to call Me affectionately to remembrance."

The Holy Communion is what our fathers called it, "A feast upon a sacrifice"; not a sacrifice, indeed, but a joyous remembrance and personal appropriation of the One Sacrifice once offered.

The Holy Communion

Such, then, is the central purpose and meaning of this sacred Ordinance. To our eyes there is nothing but the broken bread and outpoured wine, to our hearts there is the spiritual reality, the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ. The former, indeed, are but as the wick of the candle which perishes in the using; the latter is as the shining thereof, the sinner's light and peace. As the bread is given, each communicant is charged: "Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee." When the wine is given: "Drink this, in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee." "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come." Can there be anything more affecting, more binding on a Christian than that?

Who then should come to this Holy Table? Clearly those who have a thankful remembrance of the finished Sacrifice of Calvary; in other words, penitent sinners, for the primary purpose of this Sacrament is to make forgiveness sure. There are other purposes, but this is the first. Think

[1] To say with Sadler in *Church Doctrine Bible Truth* that it "corresponds" to another word, *μνημόσυνον*, is a wholly unwarranted statement. How can *remembrance*, or the act of recollecting, "correspond" to *memorial*, that which makes some one else remember? It is a shaky position that needs such a buttress as this.

of the Apostles as they celebrated the new Feast for the first time after Christ's Ascension. Picture their vivid sense of shame and contrition, for in knowing Him at last they knew themselves also. Little did they think of offering a sacrifice, much did they think of the one Sacrifice, once offered. I can almost hear one of them—one who had three times denied his Lord—whisper as he takes the broken bread: "I do this, Lord, in remembrance of Thee."

But the Eucharist is not for the individual Christian only. Like Baptism, it has to do with membership. To the Lord's Table we come as "members of one another"—we not only partake, but we share: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion[1] of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. x. 16, 17). The Sacrament, then, is no occasion of solitary worship, but a "coming together" in solemn, joyous fellowship. So strongly does the Church insist upon this that she forbids the celebration of the Holy Communion "except four (or three at the least) communicate with the priest." The baptised Christian is no isolated person, but one of a Family, a member of Christ's mystical Body. Sonship is the first thing, Brotherhood the thing that follows. To ignore this was a special sin in the Corinthian Church; the Love feast with which the Sacrament was then united was the occasion, you remember, of selfish division and gross lack of love. St. Paul does not mince matters: "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, if he discern not the body" (1 Cor. xi 29). There is one great occasion when we recognise the true *unitas fratrum*, the Church, as

[1] Not a "communication" but a participation, a joint partaking.

well as pledge ourselves to be "in perfect charity with all men," when, in a word, we "discern the body," and that is the Holy Communion. In a world full of divisions, let us not forget that fact.

Above all, it is the Holy Communion because it is a solemn act of communion with the Lord of the Church Himself. "Lift up your hearts": "We lift them up unto the Lord." In thankful remembrance of His Death "we offer and present unto Him the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, our prayers, our praises, our alms and oblations, a spiritual sacrifice, a true burnt-offering, holy and acceptable unto God. We can do nothing more, can we do anything less? It is the climax of all worship.[1]

But I must draw to a close, and I will do so by simply noticing two or three passages or subjects usually involved in this discussion—

The Capernaum Discourse

The first is the famous passage, John vi. 53–57, part of our Lord's words to the Jews in the Capernaum synagogue. "Turn not your backs," cried an eminent Churchman in St. Paul's Cathedral, "upon that Heavenly feast concerning which Christ said: 'Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last

[1] At this point may I put in an earnest plea against the modern habit of "non-communicating attendances"? Well meant, doubtless, it is really modern, and as it is without antiquity, so it is without meaning. In medieval times certain persons known as *Consistentes*, or Bystanders, were not allowed to communicate because they were "under discipline," as offenders. I shrewdly suspect that if it were generally understood that the Bystanders to-day were guilty persons "under discipline," this use so unscriptural, so uncatholic, would quickly die out. There is no blessing proper to the practice; it is a mere travesty of the Holy Communion.

day.'" Open the next High Church Manual that lies to your hand, and you will find Christ's words similarly applied to the Eucharist. But where is the historic sense of these expositors? Can they have forgotten that our Lord was addressing not a Christian congregation, but hostile Jews, and that a year before the Sacrament was instituted? I grant you that it is not possible for the Christian to-day to forget the Eucharist as he reads this passage, but to use it as the Preacher did is to be guilty of a gross anachronism, and to make salvation depend on receiving a Sacrament! The real connexion between that profound discourse and the Sacrament is this, that both set forth—the one in word, the other in symbol—the same essential truth, that the soul seeking God's salvation must depend as absolutely upon the Crucified as a famished man upon his food; and that, remember, is a truth as important to you and me as ever it was to hostile Rabbi in Capernaum synagogue.

The Re-presented Sacrifice

It is widely taught nowadays, until accepted as axiomatic truth, that our glorified Lord is pleading before God His Sacrifice on our behalf, and that at earthly altars the priest in like manner pleads the Eucharist Sacrifice. The *Guardian* (August 5, 1915) thus instructs an enquirer: "The Holy Eucharist is not absolutely in itself and of itself 'a sacrifice for sin.' It is a sacrifice in the same sense and manner as our Lord's heavenly pleading of the Death of the Cross is a sacrifice. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is on a line with the heavenly offering of which it is the earthly counterpart—that is to say, our Lord in the Eucharist transacts on earth through the agency of the priest that which He ever trans-

acts in the heavenly places. . . . When once the important truth that He is ever offering Himself in the heavenly places is grasped, the Church's participation in His heavenly action becomes intelligible and reasonable." Even Canon Mason allows himself to say in his *Truth of the Gospel:* "At the altar He allows us to do with Him what He Himself does in heaven. In this sense . . . we may say that the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice."

"This is an astonishing doctrine," writes Dr. Griffith Thomas.[1] I share his astonishment. Here is an "important truth," so important that it is the basis of a particular and widely taught doctrine of the Eucharist, which is absolutely without foundation! Is it in the Prayerbook? Is it in the Bible? If so, let us know where. Dr. Thomas justly adds: "If the Eucharist is a great and solemn Service in which the priest on earth is re-presenting and representing what our great High Priest is doing in heaven, it is at least strange that no reference should be made in the one part of the New Testament in which it would have been appropriate, if true, the Epistle to the Hebrews." Bishop Westcott carries the matter further: "The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His Passion, 'offering His blood,' on behalf of men has no foundation in this Epistle—His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly expressed the thought, by His Presence on the Father's throne."[2] That, of course, is the plain teaching of Scripture. The Offering Christ made (and made "once for all," as the Greek indicates) was Himself,

[1] *A Sacrament of our Redemption*, p. 99.

[2] In reply to a correspondent, the Bishop wrote as to this particular doctrine: "When I feel satisfied that a thing is wrong, I generally dismiss it."

yielded up in life and in death. With this priestly offering Christ entered heaven as the Mediator, having secured for sinful man "access into the holiest" by His Blood.

> "Thou standest at the altar,
> Thou offerest every prayer,"

may be good poetry, but it is very bad theology, and comes into direct collision with the Faith of the Church as expressed in the Apostles Creed: "He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty."

We must believe a Miracle occurs

I notice that at the Round Table Conference at Fulham Palace upon this Sacrament, those who maintained that consecration effects a change in the elements asserted that such change is a matter of faith. "I believe," said the President of the English Church Union, "that this change is sacramental in a sphere outside the cognizance of sense, to be accepted, and therefore to be apprehended only by faith." This is suggestive: faith is given the function of supplying lack of evidence. But Lord Halifax forgets that faith is founded *upon* evidence, and never takes its place. Our Lord's miracles were worked with the purpose of creating faith. At Cana He did not give the guests water and bid them believe it was wine. That would have been not faith, but credulity. It *was* wine, and the fact that it was wine called faith into action, so that the disciples saw His glory and believed not in a miracle, but *on Him*. The Saviour never asked for faith in a miracle, and the fact that Lord Halifax does so gives good reason for pause before accepting doctrine so supported. Such a sacramental change, indeed, is absolutely without Scripture warrant, involves the

thought of a sacerdotal priesthood of which the primitive Church, like our own, knew nothing, and is contradicted by sight, smell, and taste. In a word, we have no reason to believe it true, and every reason to believe it false.

I do not wonder that Preb. Sadler, a devout and earnest writer, has to confess that "the Eucharist has scarcely one thing in common with what the Scriptures and English Churchmen usually call sacrifice," and that Bishop Gore, in his *Body of Christ*, should write: "No doubt there is some justification at first sight for saying that the New Testament does not suggest that the Eucharist is a sacrifice"; what I do greatly wonder at is that both these writers and all of their school should, after such significant admissions, immediately go on to insist that the Eucharist does none the less possess "the most intense sacrificial reality," and support their theory by interpretations of which the Scriptures adduced are not patient.

It seems to me that they get their doctrine first, press it out of all proportion to other doctrines, and then try to make it square with the New Testament, a hopeless task.

> "For men go wrong with an ingenious skill,
> Bend the straight rule to their own crooked will,
> And with a clear and shining light supplied,
> First put it out; then take it for a guide."

I gladly admit that the poet Cowper had a very different set of theologians in mind to those earnest men whose doctrine we are discussing. If it were not for their earnestness and devotion I should feel no anxiety as to the consequences of their sacramental teaching, for it is both exaggerated and unscriptural.

A Word of Warning

But to conclude: As a loyal Churchman who thankfully recognises the comprehensive character of our Church, I am deeply concerned as to the issues of this controversy; they are not academic, the debating ground of wrangling Schoolmen, they are vital.

As soon as the transition is made from the observance of the Lord's Supper as a thankful remembrance of the completed Sacrifice of Calvary to a perpetual spiritual repetition of that sacrifice by a sacerdotal priesthood, at once its whole character is altered. The meaning of the Death of Christ is inevitably obscured, its gospel weakened. The earthly re-presentation of the Sacrifice becomes the important thing, and the mind of the worshipper diverted from the Cross is concentrated upon the present act of the Church through its official representatives. The form of consecration, "the ornaments of the minister," the posture and gesture of the celebrant, above all the material elements at the precise moment of consecration, focus the attention as of primary importance. "If the Lord's Supper is veritably a Sacrifice, Christianity is changed from a spiritual religion to a series of carnal ordinances." It is a slippery slope on which these men halt, and we have lived to see one thousand of the English clergy absolutely refuse to keep their Ordination vow of obedience to their Bishops if the purely Roman use called Exposition is still denied them. The logical conclusion of their Eucharistic doctrine is that the consecrated bread is the glorified Lord Himself, and that to "draw near to It," to "adore It," exposed in their churches, is a spiritual gain so great as to compensate for the spiritual loss of a broken vow! This

lawlessness is part of the general movement to anarchy and superstition of which so many tokens are apparent. But it is altogether lamentable and disastrous that just when society needs every aid to cohesion and order, the ministry of the National Church should present so flagrant an example of disregard for law. Its motive, as you can see, lies in erroneous doctrine.

Nor is the political danger less than any other. The keystone of that arch of priestly domination that once bestrode the world was the Mass. "It was this," wrote Dean Vaughan, once Head Master of Harrow, "that made possible the domestic tyranny of the Confessional, it was this that drew the life-blood of our English martyrs, who felt that its overthrow was worth the dying for. It is this which English innovators, calling themselves restorers, would now bring back upon us; from whose errors, or follies, or impostures—call them what you will—may God evermore preserve His true, His faithful, His Apostolic Church of England."

To all which I say, with all my heart, *Amen.*

THE PRAYERBOOK

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."—1 Thess. v. 21.

The Book of Common Prayer is the priceless possession of all Englishmen, and especially of all English Churchmen. Next to the English Bible, that other trophy of the Reformation, it has influenced for three centuries the English language, the standard of Faith, the devotion of our race. Wherever the English language is spoken—and even beyond that limit—our Prayerbook is known and held in just esteem.

The Prayerbook was not a new book at the Reformation: it was a republication or modification of the different Uses or Services, such as those of Sarum, York, Bangor, Hereford, and others, which had slowly grown up during the centuries, and which were themselves the development of still earlier liturgies. In fact, as Dean Burgon says, the Prayerbook "exhibits the accumulated wisdom, not of a single age or country, but of all the ages. The East has contributed her purest traditions; the West has enshrined them in a casket of her wisest contriving; and piety has gathered up the gems of the holiest utterance wherever syllabled, careful only to conceal the blessed speaker's name. In all its essential outlines, it has been the consolation of God's people —of our fathers, and of our father's fathers—for more than a thousand years." The Prayerbook is essentially a devotional handbook for true believers, and glows with a

spiritual fervour, which its language, stately and restrained, can hardly veil.

I wish to draw your attention to some of the advantages that our Liturgy secures to us, and then to close with a few words on what I conceive to be the present position and duty of loyal Churchmen.

Never, I suppose, was it of more importance to have a clear understanding of both the letter and spirit of our Prayerbook, and of the history of its compilation. He who is well informed on these points will be secured from Popish error on one side and Puritan innovation on the other.

A Guardian of Orthodoxy

The first thing, then, I want to emphasise is this, that in our Liturgy we have a useful guardian of Orthodoxy. This is no small advantage, as history teaches us. Those who have studied the development of the Churches tell us that even Calvin's scriptural doctrine gradually and silently gave way to a bare Socinianism, not only in Geneva, but in many of the Presbyterian congregations in England, Ireland, and the United States. So long as our Prayerbook remains, it cannot be so with ourselves. We cannot *utterly* fall away. In our churches, the pulpit here and there may be worse than useless, for dead preachers may speak to dead sinners; it may be infected with the down-grade theology, the "modernism," of the time—the children may cry for bread and get a stone; it may be semi-popish, and inculcate the Real Presence, and adoration of the elements; but always the error of the pulpit's teaching will to some extent be corrected by that of the Prayerbook, for our Liturgy, as its preface indicates, has this dominant feature—its adherence

to Holy Scripture. Take away the Bible out of the Prayer-book, and how little you have left! I believe that no other Servicebook in the world is equal to our own in this. Not merely is Scripture publicly read, and congregationally sung, in every part of our public worship, but the responses, collects, ascriptions and special Offices are steeped in Bible thought and Bible language. No man, it is not too much to say, can enter our churches and use *intelligently* 'our incomparable Liturgy' without learning his need as a sinner, the way of salvation, and the outline of Christian life. The very warp and woof of our Prayerbook is God's word, and herein lies the open secret of its spiritual power.

Congregational Worship

Again, let me remind you of the advantage of our liturgical forms in securing hearty Congregational Worship. No one can doubt the lawfulness of such forms, since our Lord taught us how to pray; but do we Churchmen sufficiently appreciate the gain? Does any Church give to the congregation so large a share in its services as our own? We have emphatically a book of Common—that is of joint—Prayer. In the first century, a heathen thus describes Christian worship: "The worshippers repeat a formula to Christ as God, in alternate responses." Could any description be more happy of parts of our own? Greatly as I value extempore prayers in our weekly prayer-meeting, how much should we not lose if we were thus limited in our public worship! We all know what we are going to pray for. We "agree on earth" as touching certain matters. We pray *with* the minister, not immediately after him. We have not to guess what he is going to say, nor are we anxious as to

whether his doctrine or political views will make it difficult for us to say heartily, *Amen*. That is not unimportant. A good Christian man declared he could not share our worship, because "there were four or five things he could not agree to in the Prayerbook." I sent him a message that if that were so, he ought to join us forthwith, for in Church he knew exactly beforehand all that he could take exception to; in chapel, he could never be sure, and only hope for the best! He was a reasonable man, it was a new light, and he joined us forthwith.

I am well aware that some excellent people outside our fold have strong objections to liturgical forms. Why fetter, they say, the free promptings of the Holy Spirit; why put a Manual composed for the use of Christians only into the hands of "a mixed multitude"? Well, if a Book of Common Prayer be wrong, so must be a Book of Common Praise, yet in thousands of chapels to-night Christians and non-Christians are singing together words like these—

> "Sun of my soul, Thou Saviour dear,
> It is not night if Thou be near;
> O may no earth-born cloud arise
> To hide Thee from Thy servant's eyes."

Can it be that what is wrong in prose, is right in verse? How dear these familiar words are, and familiarity is a help, not a hindrance, to devotion. We have not even to think of them, but simply of the wants which they so admirably unfold, and of Him to Whom we come. "If a sensible person," said Charles Simeon of Cambridge, "were to write down *all* the prayers that were uttered under the name of extempore prayer, in different chapels, for one Sunday, he would fall down on his knees, and thank God for the Liturgy of the Church of England."

A Bond of Union

It is this historic manual which links together devout Churchmen all the world over, and, year by year, carries them through the whole cycle of Christian doctrine. I like to think of it as a special bond of union between ourselves and those who go forth from us to the Mission field. Scattered in every part of the heathen and Mohammedan world, isolated it may be from home comforts and Christian intercourse, the Prayerbook ever links them with the Church at home, and week by week we all use the same words at the same Throne of Grace wherever we are. Surely, if it is a sacred delight to realise in our Communion Service that we unite in praise with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, in the very words of their *Tersanctus;* it is only a lesser delight to know that in these prayers, hallowed by a thousand years, we unite with Christian people in every part of the world below.

Reformed, Protestant, Catholic

Once again, have you ever thought how thoroughly Protestant our Liturgy is? Some of you have been perplexed, doubtless, by a sentence here and there which seems to be otherwise, and instead of interpreting such sentences by the Prayerbook as a whole, you have just reversed the process, and judged the Prayerbook by those sentences. Nothing more suicidal could be well conceived, under present circumstances, than to put a Romish interpretation upon passages which we know were never so meant by the compilers. Nothing can damage our Church more. It is well to remember that when, in Elizabeth's reign, the Pope licensed concealed Jesuits who should feign themselves

Churchmen for the purpose of sowing the seeds of disaffection in the Church of England, one of their chief instruments was the topic that the Prayerbook had not been sufficiently reformed. Of course, the Prayerbook could be amended; but do remember that as it stands it is a standing witness against papal accretions. "Away with the old rubbishy opinion," said the late Bishop Ryle, "that the Church of England occupies a middle position, a *via media*, between Dissent and Rome. You might as well talk of the Isle of Wight being midway between England and France. Between us and Rome there is a gulf both broad and deep; between us and orthodox Protestant Dissent there is but a partition wall. Between us and Rome the division is in essentials; between us and Dissent the division is about things in which a man may err and be saved." In like manner you will remember that while our Church speaks in clear and tolerant tones as to other orthodox Protestant communities, she declares the central act of worship of the Latin Church to consist of "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

No; if you want to know the real teaching of our Church, do not take, I pray you, an isolated sentence here and there out of the devotional parts of her Liturgy, but study her own authoritative declaration of her doctrines. Ask the Lutheran or Presbyterian the teaching of his Church, and he will at once refer you to the Confessions of Augsburg or Westminster. Ask the Churchman, and he too often forgets the Thirty-nine Articles. These Articles were, to a large extent, the outcome of the Romish Council of Trent, and were formulated as an emphatic protest against its decrees; for although that Council, which began in 1545, did not conclude until 1564, and our Articles were issued in 1562,

yet the leading dogmas of the Tridentine fathers were in the hands of our Reformers long before the latter date. It was in opposition to them that Archbishop Cranmer with Ridley drew up forty-two articles, which, after a subsequent revision by Archbishop Parker, Grindal, and Cox, were reduced to thirty-nine, and were solemnly agreed upon by the whole body of bishops and clergy gathered in London under Queen Elizabeth.

Bishop Christopher Wordsworth thus wrote—

"The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion contain an exposition of the doctrines of the Church of England. They contain no enactment of anything new in doctrine, but they are only a declaration of what is old. In them the Church of England affirms that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation."

The Prayerbook, remember, is not only a Manual but a manifesto, and such it was intended to be. It is not only a compilation, but a compromise between parties divided much as we are divided now, and it has been the working basis for our common worship for some three hundred years.

God forbid that I should say anything calculated to stir up strife, but when I read that Lord Halifax, the President of the English Church Union, said at the close of a carefully weighed speech: "We must strive for Union, especially with the great Latin Church, from which we were separated by the sins of the sixteenth century," and when I remember that by the "sins of the sixteenth century" he means the Reformation, and when I remember further that there can be no union with Rome except on the terms of absolute submission—a submission involving, as Dr. Salmon said, "an acknowledgment that we from our hearts believe things to be true which we have good reason for knowing

to be false"—then I say unhesitatingly that, however devout and earnest and self-sacrificing many of its members undoubtedly are, the English Church Union has become a mere Cave of Adullam for discontented Anglicans.

Bishop Samuel Wilberforce of Winchester was the most influential High Churchman of the last century; I ask you to hear some of his last words, addressed in 1873 to his Rural Deans. "There is a growing desire," he says, "to introduce novelties, such as incense, a multitude of lights in the chancel, and so on. Now these and such things are *honestly and truly alien to the Church of England.* Do not hesitate to treat them as such. There is a growing feeling which I can only describe as an ashamedness of the Anglican Church; as if our grand old Anglican Communion contrasted unfavourably with the Church of Rome. The habitual language held by many men sounds as if they were *ashamed* of our Church and its position; it is a sort of apology for the Church of England as compared with the Church of Rome. Why, I would as soon think of apologising for the virtue of my mother. I have no sympathy in the world with such a feeling. I abhor this fidgety desire to make everything un-Anglican. It is not a grand development, as some seem to think—it is a decrepitude. It is not something very sublime and impressive, but something very feeble and contemptible." What would the Bishop say if he saw the length things have gone to *now?*

II. In the second place, I want to say a few words about our present position as loyal Churchmen. The days are more critical than some of us are disposed to think. The Lincoln Judgment, confirmed by the highest Ecclesiastical Court, pronounced certain practices, such as the Eastward Position of the celebrant, not illegal in the administration

of the Holy Communion. The appeal was to Cæsar, and Cæsar has spoken. It is well, however, to remember two things. First, that the utmost declared by the Judgment about any of these things is that they are *not illegal.* Secondly, that both courts declare that these practices, though permitted, are *not to be taken as having any doctrinal significance.* Our position therefore was unaffected. As Churchmen we are exactly where we were. To talk as some do of leaving the Church of our Fathers is the language of irritation, not of reason. Never were the Evangelicals more important to their Church than to-day. I recall the telling retort of a clergyman to a parishioner, who said that she proposed to leave the Church of her baptism and join a perfect Church. "Excellent," he said, "and I hope that you will succeed, but don't forget that as soon as you have joined such a Church it will cease to be perfect!"

The well-understood process of "peaceful penetration" has gone, however, a long way since the Lincoln Judgment, and now the cry in Convocation is for Prayerbook revision. It is a serious thing to attempt the revision of such a book at this particular juncture. "Revision," said the Primate, "must be abreast of modern needs, yet loyal to the ancient order." If we can really secure *both* these things, we need not be afraid of revision. Unfortunately two opposing schemes hold the field; the one aims at a greater elasticity, and adaptation to admitted needs, while retaining "the ancient order"—and that such revision is possible was proved by the Church in Ireland when Disestablishment came—the other purposes to change our standpoint by reverting to the Prayerbook of 1549. The doctrinal changes in that book were incomplete, it was a halfway house to our own book, and those who clung to medieval superstitions

were able by slurring here and emphasising there to inculcate the very doctrines its compilers meant to discard. Now the revision the advanced party demand is practically a return to the Prayerbook of 1549. The wail of the moment is that "the Canon is dislocated"—meaningless words, I expect, to most of you, but fraught with mischief if these renovators can have their way. What is their way? Nothing less than a radical transformation of our loved Communion Office! The matter is urgent and gravely important: I want you particularly to notice how it is to be accomplished:—

To the end of the *Tersanctus* ("Holy, holy, holy") the Liturgy will remain as at present. The Prayer of Consecration will then immediately follow, its concluding *Amen* being omitted. Next to it will be placed the Prayer after the reception of the elements, with the addition of an opening "wherefore": "Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father," etc. Then will follow the Lord's Prayer, and the Prayer of Humble Access ("We do not presume"), with the consecrated elements lying on the Table, instead of, as now, before consecration. Those who communicate will then receive, and the Office will close with the Prayer beginning: "Almighty and everliving God," followed by the *Gloria* and Blessing. What is unconsumed of the elements will be reserved for the communion of the sick, and in some churches for other purposes also.

To understand the significance of all this, you must cut out and then paste in the order I have given you the different prayers, adding the "wherefore" and omitting the *Amen*. What the eye sees is worth much verbal explanation. It does not seem a great change, "only a word or two altered"; yes, but remembering the pro-

nouncement of the E.C.U. (page 79), you will find that in place of the Communion Office you have the Canon of the Mass! Picture to yourself a priest in sacerdotal vestments, with acolytes duly garbed, standing with his back to the people, using the Office thus revised, and offering adoration to Christ on the altar, and tell me what is lacking to the full Roman use? This is not revision but reversion, "*reversion to type*," as science calls it, the invariable token of decrepitude, aptly symbolised by candles burning in daylight. If these reactionary counsels wholly prevail our Church will before long cease to be the National Church, and rightly so, for she will be found unfaithful to the trust reposed in her by the Nation.[1]

Our Duty

What, then, is our duty? Twofold, I take it, in the main. First, hear the apostle speak: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." We have the Prayerbook and the Articles. We have the earliest Fathers, we have the great Divines of the Church of England down to fifty years ago, we have all the greatest modern scholars, such as Lightfoot, Hort, Westcott, Ellicott, we have the lessons of history, all on our side. We may well be thankful. I am a strong Churchman. I know why I am not a Roman Catholic, and I know why I am not a

[1] It is fair to add that it is not proposed to do away with our present liturgy. The use of either form is to be optional. I can hardly conceive a greater misfortune. "The principal act of worship" of our Church is to so differ in different churches as to be a public advertisement that she is no longer one Church but two! A great purpose of the Prayerbook was to unite the divergent "Uses" of the time in one harmonious whole, and what for over three centuries it has done, is now to be undone. Of course the ultimate but unavowed purpose is to replace our Communion Office by the Mass, but this step by step.

Nonconformist, and I am prepared, humbly I trust, to maintain my position. Of one thing I am sure, it is possible to contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the saints without breaking the ever-new Commandment of Love. If we cannot, depend upon it our position is not worth the fighting for. The matters at stake in this controversy are too tremendous for loss of temper. They are not mere questions of music, or banners, or of a trifling ceremonial: they are questions of God's truth and of Man's salvation. Contention there must be; but, I repeat, it must be in the spirit of love, or it will be contention in vain; and I say that every Evangelical Churchman ought, above all things, to know why he is what he is. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Secondly, adorn the doctrine you profess. If Evangelical Churchmanship means anything, it means not merely the head clear, but the heart right with God. It means a personal knowledge of Christ as a personal Saviour, and of the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. It means an intelligent love of the Bible, a growing unworldliness, an openly avowed love to all who love our Lord in sincerity and truth, be they Churchmen or Nonconformists, an ever intenser desire for the salvation of souls at home and abroad. In a word, it means that practical spirituality of life which is at once our only real power, and our justification before men. Any weapons but those of the Spirit will break in our hands and wound us. Use *these*, and as Christians we shall glorify God, and as Churchmen we shall be a blessing to our country.

Lastly, I say, do not shirk. The conflict is none of our seeking: it is hateful to us. But we Churchmen, loyal to Prayerbook and Articles, have greatness thrust upon us; we find ourselves trustees of the greatest Church in Christen-

dom, the Mother of Churches in all parts of the world; and for their sake, for sake of the generations yet unborn, we may not abandon our trust. Idle protestation counts for nothing. Let us close our ranks. Let us actively use all the opportunity afforded to us in Parochial, Ruridecanal and Diocesan arrangements. Especially let us instruct our young folk early, and teach them intelligently to love the Church of their fathers, and to understand *why* it is *what* it is in God's good providence. We shall need their help before long. The echoes of the Kikuyu controversy have been drowned for the moment in the roaring of artillery, but when the guns cease that controversy will come up for settlement. I am no more fearful as to the ultimate issue of the conflict in one field than I am in the other. Forces that are reactionary and exclusive will give way before those of liberty and truth. The days are difficult at present, and the near distance not clear, but the horizon is bright. Arthur Clough's lines haunt me :—

"Say not 'The struggle nought availeth,
The labour and the wounds are vain,
The enemy faints not, nor faileth,
And as things have been they remain.'

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
It may be in yon smoke concealed,
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

And not by Eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright."

THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE

"And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ."—PHIL. i. 9, 10.

"THAT ye may approve things that are excellent"; that is, in the original Greek, "That between things that are alike excellent you may judge or distinguish"—exactly bringing us to our subject, "The relative importance of the different means of grace."

We all feel that we live in perplexing times. In the State there is admittedly an upheaval, and on all sides we see indications of social and political convulsion. In the Churches, amid many activities, we have distinct evidence in some directions of decadence. There is a marked decay of the Lord's Day observance. There is a conformity to the world. There is a growing use of worldly means for spiritual ends; and too often the papers tell us of some terrible divorce, in church or chapel, of the gospel and common honesty, which it is painful, but necessary, to confess.

Why do I mention these things? Because I believe them to be closely connected with our subject. I believe that on observing the relative importance of the means of grace depends to no small extent the spiritual life of the individual Christian. I believe that Churchmen especially, with their authorised standards of faith and doctrine, and holding the

position they do, have a grave responsibility in this matter; and that, when a majority of them invert these divinely ordered proportions, we may reasonably expect a decay of spiritual life in the Church, which will be quickly reflected in the nation.

That such an inversion has taken place I shall attempt to show. The question is one of highest importance, for, what are the means of grace? What, indeed, is grace? I reply: God in action towards sinful men in Christ Jesus, and by "means of grace" I understand those ordained channels in and through which He is usually pleased to act. As I utter the words, my heart goes up in wonder at the variety of such means which it has pleased Him to provide. It is as if He, Who from the beginning "rejoiced in the habitable parts of the earth," longed to use every means that Divine Wisdom could devise, of intercourse and communion with His creatures. Yet, as the colours of the rainbow, blending in one harmonious whole, are distinct, and bear a definite relation the one to the other on which the perfection of the whole depends, so is it with the different means of grace. I can of course only select: I will take four of the most important, upon which I have already spoken, viz. the Christian Ministry, the Sacraments, the Scriptures, and Prayer; and with what fairness I can, I shall endeavour to show the relative importance attached to these by the dominant party in our Church, and then state what I believe that proportion is designed by God to be.

I. The New Order

There can be no question but that in the minds of a majority of our most zealous Church-people the ordained

Ministry occupies a position that it has not occupied for three hundred years. The theory of Apostolical Succession is still widely held in its most naked form—that the Bishops are the representatives of the Apostles, and the heirs of their spiritual power; and this by virtue of a direct devolution of that power through an unbroken succession of laying on of hands, down from the Apostolic age itself. The logical issue of this view is found in the common formula, "No Bishop, no Church." To the second order of the Ministry are widely assigned sacerdotal titles, functions, and powers; "on which," to use Bishop Gore's words, "the validity of the Sacraments depends." There is an increasing number who believe that by virtue of the Priest's *Absolvo te*, heard in the Confessional, all sin is remitted; and a multitude, who do not go so far as this, do sincerely believe that certain words of consecration change, if not the actual substance of the bread and wine, at least their essential character. While refusing the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, their own formula as to the Presence of Christ in the sacred elements differs from it in words only; while as to the offering of Christ in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, there is not even a verbal difference. The result is what we see. The Holy Communion is pushed into an exaggerated place among the means of grace. It is the grand remedy for the spiritual needs of all the baptised. "Come to the Holy Altar as partakers, and, if not, as worshippers," is the call from hundreds of our pulpits week by week. Again and again we are told that it is the principal act of worship, as well as the chief means of holiness. Everything is sacrificed to the sacrifice of the Altar. It is not long since a well-known Church paper condoned the spending of the Lord's Day in pleasure, if only the Supper, instituted

in the evening, were taken first thing in the morning. Evening Communion is an abomination because it cannot be received, as it is said it should be, fasting. In short, as "No Bishop, no Church," so it is distinctly held, "No Priest, no Sacrament."

In proportion to this extreme exaltation of the Sacrament among the means of grace, the Bible has taken a lower place in the hearts of myriads of honest Churchmen. About this there can be no question; indeed it is openly avowed that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the secret of an uncatholic Protestantism. "The Bible and tradition, the Bible and primitive antiquity, the Bible and the voice of the Church, contain together the rule of faith;" "The Church to teach, the Bible to prove." Ever since Keble published Tract 78, and declared that Scripture and Tradition together are the joint Rule of Faith, this doctrine has been proclaimed upon the housetops. This fully accounts for the lower esteem in which the Bible is held by the mass of the neo-Anglican party. The Scriptures, we are told, are not to be put hastily into the hands of the young and ignorant; and I can speak confidently as an old Oxford man, who has kept touch, so far as he may, with Church matters, that a large proportion of zealous Anglicans practically do not read their Bibles at all. I put down this decay of interest in the Bible far more to the general attitude of a powerful section of Churchmen than to the Higher Criticism, which has hardly touched the bulk of our church-going folk.

The last of the means of grace I instance is Prayer. Thank God, prayer is insisted on by High Churchmen as earnestly as by ourselves. I rejoice to know a score of devout men, from whom I totally differ on important

Church matters, with whom I should count it a privilege to kneel in prayer; and for that very reason I would ask them whether their tireless insistence on the duty of matins and evensong is not undermining secret prayer? Is there not a real danger of the supposed claims of public worship invading the sacred duties of the chamber? We have been plainly told by one of their journals that prayers said in the church are more acceptable to God than prayers said in the chamber, and I say sadly I have reason to fear that numbers of well-meaning Churchmen are giving up, first, Family Prayer, that great bond of the Christian family, for Matins; and the sacred communion of the closet for the Early Celebration in the church. Does it answer? Is the nation becoming more really prayerful? Are not the effects of the loudly proclaimed theory of priestly intercession visible already, when in scores of churches day by day the clergyman may be seen monotoning morning prayer to a congregation consisting of some of his own family and the verger? I greatly fear that the principle, "*Qui facit per alium facit per se*," is leading to deserted closets and to frequent Services, and frequent Services tend too often to empty churches. Is this to be wondered at? God made the Home the centre of family religion, man has made that centre the Church.

I am most anxious not to exceed the limits of actual fact in what I am saying; I repeat that I am not alluding to particular churches, but to my High Church friends as a whole, and I say that, so far as I can judge, Episcopacy is held first in esteem among the means of grace, because neither Church nor Sacraments, it is supposed, can exist without it; and Scripture and Prayer in practical working take distinctly lower places. I believe this order to be an

inverted order; I believe this lack of proportion to be full of danger both to Church and State, and I shall now venture to indicate what I believe to be the true relative importance of these means of grace.

II. The True Order

As loyal Churchmen, I claim that we yield to none in the value we set upon the Christian Ministry. We hold an ordained ministry to be a special gift of our ascended Lord. We accept the threefold order of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon. We claim emphatically the historical succession of the Church of England. Episcopacy we hold essential to the well-being, not to the being, of a church; but we do *not* hold Apostolical Succession in the sense asserted as essential. We hold it to be a theory incapable of proof, discredited by the latest and best scholarship, and worth nothing spiritually if it were proved. Carefully guarding as we do Episcopal ordination, we cling to our Church Article, and will not for a moment allow that the last fledgling admitted to Holy Orders, be he good, bad, or indifferent, is a true and lawful minister of Jesus Christ; and that Matthew Henry, and Doddridge, and Robert Hall, and Chalmers, and Spurgeon were nothing of the kind.

As to the second order of the Ministry, we remember that "priest" is but presbyter writ small, and assert emphatically that no presbyter can do more than authoritatively declare the terms upon which God is pleased to forgive sins. As to the Sacraments, we would point out that, in regard to that of Baptism, its validity so little depends upon Apostolic Succession, that it does not necessarily depend upon a clergyman at all; but may be administered under

certain circumstances by a layman, or even by a midwife, and it cannot be repeated.

In the Lord's Supper we maintain jealously that the consecrated elements are bread and wine still, nothing more and nothing less. We assert, with our Article, that the blessing of the Sacrament—which is indeed nothing less than a communion of the Body and Blood of Christ—depends wholly and entirely upon the hearts of those who receive, and not upon the acts of those who consecrate; and we hold that the adoration now so commonly offered to the Presence in the consecrated elements is dangerously akin to "idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians." We assert that the ordained priest has no sacerdotal character whatever, save and except that which every Christian shares, whether he be cleric or lay. We affirm, with Hooker, that "Sacrifice is no part of our Church's ministry"; and we appeal to antiquity, and say that the earliest Fathers never asserted it was.

Our position is perfectly clear, and confidently we claim Bible, Prayerbook, and History, and the greatest Divines of the English Church in support of it; but if so, the Sacraments stand on a wholly different footing from that commonly assigned to them, and we must discover some other principle for determining their relative importance.

I venture to lay down three propositions. First, *that the proportionate value of any doctrine, or ordinance of the Christian Faith, may be ascertained by the frequency and urgency with which it is enforced in the Bible*, and especially in the Epistles, which teach doctrines, just as the Gospels mainly record the facts on which those doctrines are based. Apply this test to the Lord's Supper; and, if accustomed to the extravagant language of the day, you will be startled by

the contrast, and by the small place it relatively occupies in the New Testament.

About Faith and Works, about Holiness and Unholiness, about Justification and Sanctification, we have line upon line, and precept upon precept. For one mention of the Lord's Supper you will find fourteen about the Return of Christ in His Kingdom. You will find that blessed Ordinance is described in one Epistle, and that in all the other twenty it is not so much as mentioned. I cannot get over this fact, I am bound to give it due weight, for the silence of Scripture is often as eloquent as its voice. This argument of course is flouted, but I have not yet seen it answered. It seems to me a perfectly obvious contention, and in using it I am glad to find an unconscious ally in Mr. Sadler, in his *Church Doctrine, Bible Truth.* "Judged by their respective services," he says (p. 117), "Baptism has a far higher position in the English than in the Romish Church." And he proves it thus: "In the Romish office the administration of the Sacrament itself is thrust into a corner, and four-fifths of the Service have to do with other ceremonies (exorcisms, benedictions, and the like), so that in a copy of the *Rituale Romanum* now before me, out of ten pages occupied by the Baptismal Service, not two have to do with the Sacrament itself." Mr. Sadler's point is conclusive; but this is exactly our own argument from the place the Lord's Supper holds in the New Testament. If the inspired writers of the first century were right in the way they dealt with the Lord's Supper, I cannot help feeling that some of the uninspired writers of the twentieth century are entirely wrong. Even were their doctrine of the Eucharist primitive and Catholic, their exaggeration of it would make it so far untrue.

My second proposition is this: *That the relative importance of the means of grace may be further ascertained by the admitted necessities of the regenerated soul.* As there is an analogy, divinely taught, between physical and spiritual birth, so there is a likeness between the intuitive longings of the infant and of the new-born soul. As the one cannot be satisfied without its mother's milk, so the other is athirst for God's word. "As new-born babes," writes St. Peter, "desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." Again and again, until I take it as one of the best evidences of the Spirit's quickening work, have I heard men say: "The Bible has become a new book to me." Nor is this all; as men grow in grace, the "sincere milk" is exchanged for the "strong meat" of their full manhood in Christ: it is the strong man who cries, "Thy words were found, and I did eat them, and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart" (Jer. xv. 16). "I," said a great Church leader, "did not learn my divinity at one only time, but was constrained to search deeper and deeper, to which my temptations brought me; for no man without trials and temptations can attain to the true understanding of the Holy Scriptures." Hear, again, Ridley, our blessed martyr-bishop, whom Cambridge trained, and Oxford, I am sorry to say, burned; he is writing just before his fiery death, and thus says he: "In thy orchard, Pembroke Hall (the wals, buttes, and trees, if they could speak would beare me witnes), I learned without booke almost all Paul's Epistles, yea, and I weene all the Canonicall Epistles, save only the Apocalyps. Of which study, although in time a great part did depart from me, yet the sweete smell thereof I trust I shall carry with me into heaven; for the profite thereof I thinke I have felt in all

my lyfe-tyme ever after." "So shall it be with us also," comments Bishop Moule, "if we go and do likewise in our 'lyfe-tyme'—our period, not at present of martyrdom, but, God knoweth it, of need."

And if we look humbly at Him who "left us an example that we should follow His steps," were not the daily needs of His life met chiefly by the Old Testament writings? To understand them He learned two difficult languages; by His constant use of them, not less than by His emphatic vindication of the authenticity and inspiration of the Old Testament Canon, we learn their relative place. With the Scripture He resisted the Tempter in the wilderness, with the Scripture He opened His mouth and taught the people, with the Scripture He confuted scribe and Sadducee: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God"; with the Scripture on His lips He died; and when the glorious Easter dawned and He revealed Himself to shattered hopes and aspirations, it was once again to appeal to the written word, for, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself."

And if the Master's needs were thus (though not thus exclusively) met, how must it be with the disciple? We are not left in doubt. In John vi. our Lord declares Himself to be the living Bread come down from heaven, of which if a man eat he shall live for ever. Not unnaturally perplexed, His hearers seek to know His meaning, and He explains it thus, "The words that I have spoken" (*i. e.* those last utterances of Mine) "are spirit and are life"; "that is," says Bishop Westcott, "belong essentially to the region of eternal being, and so are *capable of conveying that which they essentially are.*" "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words

of eternal life," cry the disciples, and our hearts echo their cry. And as life comes through Christ's words, so "he that *keepeth* them" is solemnly declared to have fellowship with Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (John xiv.). The Epistles enlarge upon this teaching. St. Peter reminds the Church that it is through reception of God's "precious and exceeding great promises that we become partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. i. 4). St. James bids us "receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your souls" (i. 21), and that is the position of the inspired writers generally. How impossible is the practical limitation of "the means of grace" to the two Sacraments in the light of typical passages such as these! If Simon Magus, baptised but still unregenerate, was ever to become a child of God, what other method for him was there but to receive, under the Spirit's teaching, the life-giving word?

If you want to know how a great Churchman, firmly holding Primitive and Catholic doctrine, loves the Lord's Supper, I would have you read Adolphe Monod's *Farewell;* or, better still, the writings of the Fathers of the English Church. It is really painful to have to compare the relative place of two essential means of grace, nor would it be necessary but for the unprimitive and uncatholic teaching so prevalent about the Sacraments. Uncatholic, I repeat, for if "Catholic" means, among other things, "*quod semper*," it includes *ab initio*, viz. the New Testament times and teaching.

The Church's Teaching

The Church insists upon this proportion, if not in words, at least in practice. Her Liturgy, as I have shown you, is steeped in Scripture. Her Sixth Article declares: "Holy

Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be observed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite to salvation." How different her attitude towards that blessed Sacrament she so jealously guards from Zwinglian half-truth, and Roman innovation: "There shall be no communion except four (or three at the least) communicate with the Priest." And again in the Rubric concerning small parishes, "There shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate with the Priest according to his discretion." I ask emphatically, how dare our Church thus restrict the opportunities of Holy Communion; making them, in fact, contingent on the number of communicants, or the discretion of the Curate, if she holds the doctrine of the English Church Union? The place she assigns to Scripture and this Sacrament respectively in her public Services is eloquent of her view; and certainly it is not he who thoughtfully adopts it who deserves to be called an ill-taught or disloyal Churchman. The lack of balance so painfully evident in modern Anglican teaching on this subject, can only be explained by its exponents having ceased to check their writings by the study of the Scriptures.

High as is the position thus given to Scripture, there is, judging by the universal instincts of the regenerate soul, one means of grace more important still; I mean, of course, Prayer. Prayer is closely linked with Scripture. The promises of God are the basis of prayer. The encouragement to prayer is the bidding of God. The best words of prayer are often the very words of God; but, nevertheless, first in order of time and of importance is Prayer. The inarticulate cry of the new-born babe is the first joyful

intimation to the mother's heart that a man is born into the world; and, "Behold, he prayeth," is God's own convincing illustration of His quickening work. Of our duty to the Scriptures nothing is said like this: "Pray without ceasing" (1 Thess. v. 17), or, "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit" (Eph. vi. 18). Here, again, his Lord's example in prayer—deliberate, sustained, ejaculatory, public, private, secret prayer—is the Christian's assurance both of the need and place of prayer. "Prayer is the Christian's vital breath." It is so on earth; it will be so, we believe, in heaven. Dear as is the Lord's Supper to every true disciple, it is but a pledge of something dearer far, the personal visible presence of His Lord; in this sense it speaks to him of a real absence, for it is only "till He come." In due time it will surrender its place and use; for when we gaze on Him "who was wounded for our transgressions," Sacraments will be needed no more. The Books of the Old and New Testaments will cease to speak to us when we see no more through a glass darkly, and "know even as also we are known." But through eternity, I take it, Prayer will ever mingle with Praise, and with ever deepening meaning we shall cry, "Teach me to do Thy will, for Thou art my God."

My last proposition is this: *That we can, to some extent, test the relative importance of the different means of grace by the effects they produce.* Upon this only a few words before I close, but uttered with a deep conviction that they are substantially true.

It is by results, results visible in life and conduct, that the truth of doctrines must ultimately be tested. Christianity itself, compared with other systems of faith, must stand or fall by this test. Within the Christian faith there are a

variety of means of grace, some more, and some less, essential. Commensurate with the claims put forth for one or other of these, results must be apparent, or the claims themselves become open to suspicion: "With Truth all facts and realities agree," says Aristotle. Put modern claims as to the Sacraments to this simple test, and what do we find? We have the means of judging. One, peculiarly painful, lies to our hand; I mean the recent public refusal of not less than one thousand of the "advanced" clergy to obey their bishops in their prohibition of "Exposition," a use which has no claim whatever to be Catholic. If the Eucharist were indeed, as these men all insist, "an Extension of the Incarnation," an impartation of the glorified humanity of Christ, I should expect to see Christ's attitude to "Cæsar" repeated and illustrated. Against laws wicked and harsh, lawlessness was no weapon of Jesus Christ. I hold these men sincere and conscientious, but their creed is shattered against their conduct. More generally, let us take one important section of our population, distinguished by its wealth, its general intelligence, and better cared for by the High Church clergy than any other equal number of such persons in the world. I mean, of course, those who live in the West End of London. Large numbers attend the fashionable churches. Large numbers, larger than ever before, are communicants. Urged, persuaded, entreated, they come to "the Mass," especially to early celebrations. Many of them doubtless are most sincere Christians, but how does a large proportion of them afterwards "kill Sunday"? I could speak from some personal knowledge, but it is less invidious and more important to hear what the Bishops say. In their utterance a few years back on the growing desecration of the Lord's Day they spoke with no uncertain sound. They are dealing with London Society

that goes to church and admits the authority of bishops. They tell of picnics on the Thames, of tennis parties, of fashionable visiting, of late dinners. The majority of these worldlings have been baptised and confirmed, a proportion of them are communicants, and on the "Catholic" theory the seed or "faculty" of divine life should fructify. Their clergy rebuke these frivolities and sins, they speak, they preach; but what never seems to occur to them is that their doctrine of the Sacraments may be fundamentally wrong! I am not playing one school of Churchmen against another, the times are far too serious for that; I am willing to admit that Bible-reading and prayer are not charms but channels, and sometimes empty channels. I only wish to test a certain Eucharistic doctrine by setting it alongside the facts of life, and to urge that in practical working it does not obviously result in that sanctification of life, that separation from the world, that concern for the evangelisation of mankind, which surely would follow were it true. But I put it to you, were you to hear that these same fashionable people who throng the communion rails of our West End churches, and spend the rest of the week in frivolity, had suddenly become earnest in Bible study, earnest in secret Prayer, would you expect London Society to continue what it is to-day? And if not, why not? Does not your answer prove that in your inmost heart you do not believe the Eucharist occupies the solitary pre-eminence claimed for it among the means of grace, and that other means, not less ordained of God, need to be exalted in their due and proper proportion?

But I must not close these Addresses in the minor key. I am full of hope. My studies would lead me to believe that the so-called Catholic Revival is only a backwater in the real stream of the Church's life. The spirituality and devo-

tion of its leaders are beyond question, their influence is great, and (if they knew it) proportionate to their hold upon evangelical truth; but their distinctive tenets are untrue, because unchecked by Scripture and by any proper co-ordination with daily life. The time will surely come when those who now are misled will look for themselves into the pages of the New Testament and primitive Church doctrine, and inquire whether these things are so. Such a time may not be so far distant. There is a certain restiveness among those High Churchmen whose proper home is the Church of England. The *Guardian*, just to hand (June 21, 1917), loses patience at last over the latinizing disloyalists: "The religion of the Church of England is Catholic and Evangelical in the fullest sense of the words, and though there may be many defects in the manner of its expression, we are not likely to cure them by borrowing from Rome. The time is coming when a final choice must be made between the exotic 'Catholicism' of extremists who deny the right of private judgment to everybody but themselves, and the sane, ordered, and historic Catholicism for which Hooker and Andrewes, Ken and Keble stood. Let us not shrink from making that choice. The members of a Divine Society must at least be faithful, and the time has come to make it clear that for us in England the 'Catholic Church' is the English and not the Roman branch of the Universal Church." So far as it goes, this is hopeful.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S.E. 1, AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

INFANT BAPTISM: Its Scriptural Basis and Privilege. 1*s*. Marshall Brothers.

CONFIRMATION LECTURES. On the Catechism—for the use of Clergy and Teachers. 1*s*. net. Syllabus for the use of Candidates, 1*d*. Robert Scott.

HOLY COMMUNION. A Devotional Manual, with Critical Notes. 1*s*. net, cloth; 6*d*. net, paper. The Church Book Room, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.

280.3R
B267

Barnes-Lawrence, Rev. H. E.

A churchman and his church...

280.3R
B267